DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 623 RC 011 622

AUTHOR Young, Ruth C.; And Others
TITLE Migrant Farmworkers in Western New York, 1978.
INSTITUTION Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N.Y. Dept. of Rural Sociology.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 108p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Agricultural Production; Blacks; Crew Leaders; *Demography; Ethnic Groups; *Farmers; Farm Labor; Human Services; Mexican Americans; Migrant Children; *Migrant Employment; Migrant Problems; *Migrant Workers; Migration Patterns; *Needs Assessment; Puerto Ricans; Work Attitudes; Work Environment; Working Hours
IDENTIFIERS New York (Central); *New York (West)

ABSTRACT

To provide current demographic and needs assessment information for public and private agencies serving migrants, a survey was conducted among farmers and the migrant workers they employed. Of 228 migrant labor camps in western and central New York, 57 were selected for study by a stratified random sampling procedure which assured adequate representation of all ethnic groups. Interviews were obtained in 44 of the 57 camps (77%); 36 farmer interviews and 176 migrant interviews were conducted. The farmer questionnaire dealt primarily with the history of the farm, crop-related changes, and recent and foreseeable changes in the use of migrant workers. The migrant questionnaire obtained extensive demographic data, work history (including experience with crew leaders), and information about contact with the agencies intended to serve migrants in New York State. Findings showed ethnic differences in choice of crop, time spend in New York, family situation, and income. With the exception of food stamps and child care and health programs, no federal, state, or local aid programs were heavily used. Agencies providing services need to consider effective ways of coordinating services and publicizing their programs among migrants. (JH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED175623

MIGRANT FARMWORKERS IN WESTERN NEW YORK, 1978

RUTH C. YOUNG
BRUCE M. JOHN
CHRISTOPHER HERMANN

and

DELOS R. WHITMAN

DEPARTMENT OF RURAL SOCIOLOGY
CORNELL UNIVERSITY
ITHACA, NEW YORK 14853

JOB SERVICE DIVISION
NYS DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
ALBANY, NEW YORK 12240

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bruce M. John

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

OCT 1979
ERIC/CRESS
RECEIVED

RC011622

MIGRANT FARMWORKERS IN WESTERN NEW YORK, 1978

by

Ruth C. Young
Bruce M. John
Christopher Hermann

and

Delos R. Whitman

Department of Rural Sociology
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14853

Job Service Division
NYS Department of Labor
Albany, New York 12240

April 1979

Cornell University is an equal opportunity affirmative action educator and employer

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Research on the needs and characteristics of migrant farm workers in the western part of New York State was undertaken jointly by the Department of Rural Sociology at Cornell University and the New York State Department of Labor. It was funded through the New York State College of Agriculture by Title V funds of the Rural Development Act and through the New York State Department of Labor by the Farmworker Service Special Coordinating Project of the New York State Department of Labor Job Service Division, funded from the Office of Farm Worker Programs, CETA Title III, Section 303.

Research on the migration of labor affects the interests and well-being of numerous groups in New York society. Farmers are affected by wage scales, support facilities demanded of them, and federal regulation of their operations. Individual migrant families are also personally affected by the amount of their take-home pay, the support services available to their families, and the ease or difficulty of finding a new job once one is finished. There are also various state and federal agencies which have areas of responsibility for enforcing laws and providing services, along with numerous private agencies who have interests in and responsibility for helping migrant farm workers.

Often there is conflict among these various interests. Sometimes the conflict is based on real differences, sometimes it is based on poor communication. (Indeed, it is difficult to imagine good communication among such a variety of groups and persons as those who are involved in migrant programs.)

To accomplish this task of research on the needs and characteristics of migrant farm workers we must have access to the range of opinions, facts,

attitudes, and even ideologies which characterize or are held by the various participants in all these programs. We must also be independent. Our purpose is to determine the facts. (We remember that opinions, even erroneous ones, are "facts" in that they exist and even determine behavior.) This we have tried to do. To accomplish our objective we have had access to a variety of groups, many of which are in disagreement with one another. To these groups we extend our thanks for their openness, honesty, and fullness of information. We especially thank Rural New York Farmworker Opportunities, Inc., for their generous cooperation and for their administering the funds of the New York State Department of Labor used for this study.

Many individuals also helped us. Among them are the interviewers: Regla Wilson, Julie Craft, Sister Rene Roberto, John Saloane, Emma Jeulius, Joyce Jones, Dolores Burke, Virginia Angelico, Virginia Cowan, and Kitty Fowler; the coders; the farmers; Phyllis Hurlbut, who helped with computer work; secretaries Kathi Giedris and Wendy Barrett; Lucy Cunnings, who made editorial suggestions; the migrant workers; and people in the many agencies.

We also wish to thank Ward W. Bauder and Olaf F. Larson, who gave advice and support and whose previous work provided a basis for this study, and Kenneth F. Delphey, Benjamin English, William Saffran and Calvin J. Warne, all of the New York State Department of Labor, for their generous and continuous advice throughout the whole course of the study.

However, the design of the research and sampling procedures, the design of the questionnaire, supervision and training of interviewers, analysis of results, and the content of this publication are the sole responsibility of the authors. The confidentiality of the information provided by the farmers and migrant farmworkers, to whom we owe the grestest debt for their cooperation, has been completely protected. The views expressed herein are those of the authors only and are not the official views of either Cornell

University or the New York State Department of Labor. The authors have tried to set forth the facts as objectively as possible, or where these are in dispute to set forth the different points of view as we were best able to ascertain them.

MIGRANT FARMWORKERS IN WESTERN NEW YORK, 1978

Introduction

Migrant laborers have been coming to New York State for nearly 50 years. During this period, they have been indispensable to agricultural production. Studies of migrant laborers in New York have been made at various periods, but the last such study (Bauder, 1970) is now eight years old, and the nature of the jobs utilizing migrant farmworkers (laborers) and the composition of the work force have been changing constantly. In recent years, many agencies have been working in behalf of migrants in the state. Early in 1978 a number of public and private agencies working with migrants felt that information from earlier studies might no longer be applicable. To help them provide effective service to migrants and to the farmers for whom they work, more up-to-date and complete information about the workers was needed. In particular, who are the migrants now? Where do they come from? What ethnic groups are represented? What are their ages and education? What proportion are female? How many are married, and what is their burden of child care? Exactly what do they do here in New York, how do they live, what work do they do, what do they earn, and what importance does their work in New York have in their work year? What contacts do they now have with the social agencies? What unmet needs do they have?

The method of providing systematic information on these and other questions was a sample survey of migrant workers living in central and western New York migrant labor camps (from Oswego County west) registered with the New York State Department of Health. New York State law requires all camps used for housing seasonal farmworkers to apply for and receive a permit to operate when they are to be occupied by 5 or more people,

at least one of whom is employed in agriculture. The survey, supplemented by informal conversation and observation, provides the data bearing on the migrant's situation and his point of view. The farm context in which the labor is performed comes from a structured interview conducted with each farmer whose camp was sampled, supplemented again by conversations with many of these farmers. Informal interviews were conducted with persons in each of the social agencies working with migrants in the sample area. To some extent, then, this report will try to present three aspects: the migrant's situation, the farmer's, and that of the social agencies that serve migrants. However, it will deal primarily with information obtained about the migrant farmworker in western New York.

Methods

Most of the information presented in this report was obtained from two sets of questionnaires--one administered to farmers or the persons in charge of incorporated farms, and the other administered to the migrant farmworkers they employed during the 1978 season. The following section describes how the sample of farms and farmworkers was constructed, the procedures followed in conducting the interviews and collecting information, and the relative success of the entire methodology.

An initial decision was made to study only one-half of the state in 1978. The central and western portion of the state, including all counties from Oswego west, was selected. Map 1 shows the number of camps operating in each county in 1977. The total population of farms from which we sampled was defined as all farms or labor camps in this area that were inspected in 1977 by the N.Y. State Department of Health in accordance with state regulations for operating a migrant labor camp. The State Department of Health provided a list of 228 farms or camps in the sample area. It should be

pointed out that inspected camps are only those with a total capacity of five or more people, one of which is a seasonal farmworker. Therefore, no camps with less than five occupants were included in the initial population.

Because of the strong association between ethnicity and crops worked on, a stratified random sample seemed the surest means of guaranteeing that all major ethnic groups and crops which involve migrant labor would be adequately represented in the final sample. The crop groups, constructed in line with suggestions provided by members of the N.Y. State Department of Labor, were as follows:

1) Apples, Wayne County (black)
2) Apples, and vegetables, other counties (black)
3) Processing plants (Puerto Rican)
4) Vegetables (Puerto Rican)
5) Potatoes (black)
6) Miscellaneous crop types (Mexican)

The section on crops shows how the actual situation compared with the sampling plan. Given the available time, resources, and manpower, it was decided that approximately 50 camps could be handled during the summer of 1978. Also, this was about one quarter of the total number of camps in the sample area, which was thought to be fairly representative of the total population of 228 camps. Therefore, a sample of 25 percent was made within each of the ethnic crop group strata, giving a total sample of 57 camps. This number of sample camps seemed large enough to allow for a number of refusals by farmers or corporate administrators without adversely affecting the total size of the final sample. In Map 1 the counties where the sample farms and camps were located are shaded. Though there were a number of farms using migrant workers in Oswego County, none happened to be included in the sample. This was due simply to the random selection of the sampling process. The actual number of farms selected from each county was as follows:

Chautauqua	- 1	Ontario	- 1
Erie	- 3	Orleans	- 11
Genesee	- 1	Steuben	- 1
Livingston	- 3	Wayne	- 25
Monroe	- 1	Wyoming	- 4
Niagara	- 6		

NEW YORK STATE

MAP I

COUNTIES IN WHICH THE SAMPLED FARMS WERE LOCATED

The sampling area consists of counties west of the black line. Shaded counties contain camps that actually were drawn as part of the sample.

(Numbers indicate number of migrant labor camps under permit, by county, 1977. Total number = 515 camps.)

The next step was to establish the sampling rate within each camp to obtain an adequate number of migrant farmworker interviews. It was decided that since the 57 camps had a listed total camp capacity of 1213, 300 interviews would be a realistic (again, in terms of time, money, and manpower) and sufficiently representative number of interviews. However, camps are rarely full to capacity; therefore, an estimate of what proportion of the capacity number of farmworkers would be in the camp at the peak of the season was needed. At the start of the study in June, the best estimate that the N.Y. State Department of Labor could provide was 90 percent. The anticipated number of migrant farmworkers in the sample of 57 farms and camps was thus approximately 1092 (i.e., 90 percent of 1213). To obtain a sample of 300 from this estimated population, a sampling rate of 33 percent with the camp seemed adequate and allowed for a number of refusals by farmworkers.

As mentioned above, two questionnaires were constructed. The items included in both questionnaires had been obtained from discussions between those working for the New York State Department of Labor and the research group at Cornell University. The farmer questionnaire dealt primarily with the history of the farm, crop-related changes, and recent and foreseeable changes in the use of migrant workers. The migrant questionnaire was much more extensive, but in general it included questions covering the migrant's social characteristics and family composition, work history--both long-term and recent, with special attention focused on the work he or she performed in the past year--and contact with the various agencies and services that are intended to serve migrants and their families while in New York State.

The Department of Labor, in cooperation with Rural New York Farmworkers, Inc., screened and hired all interviewers used for this study. As for the interviewers, nine of a total of ten were women; four were black, five were

white and one was Puerto Rican. It is worth pointing out here that several were familiar with migrant farmwork and one interviewer was the wife of a migrant farmworker. During the analysis of the data, a statistical check was made on a wide variety of items which might be sensitive to or biased by the ethnicity of the interviewer. In fact, for the items so tested, no such bias was found.

Under no conditions did interviewers enter a camp without the farmer's permission to do so. It was also made clear that the interviewers were in the camps only to collect information and not to advocate or disseminate information about any program or policy.

By the end of September, the survey had yielded only 175 interviews. What accounted for this? First, the estimate of the actual number of farmworkers present in each camp was entirely too high. The actual number proved to be only 63 percent of the total camp capacity. A comparison of Wayne County, where 25 out of the initial 57 camps were located, to the rest of the sample shows little variation in this figure. For Wayne County the actual capacity percentage was 68 percent, whereas elsewhere it was 61 percent--a negligible difference. Second, the refusal rate by farmers was much higher than anticipated. Those experienced at dealing with farm owners or operators who use migrant labor estimated this rate to be approximately 10 percent. The following presents the actual result:

	Wayne County	Rest of Sample	Total Sample
Total number of farms sampled	25	32	57
Farmer/operator refusals	3	2	5
Duplicate selection of a farm and its outside labor camp	1	0	1
Farmer unable to get workers	0	1	1
Farm association refusals (includes all four farms in Wyoming County)	0	4	4
Farmworkers in the camp as a group refuse to participate	1	1	2
Total loss	5	8	13

The important percentage here is the mortality rate for the entire sample--13 out of an initial 57, or 23%. As for direct refusals by farmers, the figure is 9 out of 57, approximately 16%, which was higher than initially estimated. Since this includes all 4 camps in Wyoming County, where the Farmers Association decided not to participate at all, Wyoming County cannot be considered part of the study. The 23% total loss of camps included some 214 workers, costing the survey 71 potential interviews. On the other hand, it should be pointed out and even emphasized that the farmworkers actually were very cooperative. Out of 110 contacts outside of Wayne County, only 8 refused to be interviewed; for Wayne County, out of 78 contacts only 5 refused, making the overall refusal rate for farmworkers only 7 percent.

A third reason why the actual number of interviews was less than originally desired is that the interviewers drew their sample from a list of workers for the day of the interview given to them by the farmer, farm operator, crew chief or person in charge. There is good reason to believe that these lists were incomplete and underrepresented the actual number of workers in the camp. In short, the effect would be to decrease the number of interviews conducted. However, such lists are still the best available means of defining the total population in any given camp at any point in time.

The final result of 176 interviews is nonetheless representative of the area studied this year except for Wyoming County. There is reason to believe that Wyoming County is different than the rest of the area not only with respect to the main crop raised, potatoes, but also with respect to organization of the migrant work situation. In Wyoming County it is a common practice for a farmer to make a contract with a crew leader to pick, load, and truck, and to unload at the elevator or grader (perhaps also weighing, grading, and sacking), bringing with him his crew and trucks. We have no way of knowing, therefore, how results of the study would apply to this very different area.

However, though the interview mortality rate through farmer refusal and other causes was higher than desired, it is not excessive to the point of undermining the validity of the data.

The Context of Migrant Farm Labor - What Is Happening on the Farms

Much better sense can be made of the migrant farmworkers' situation if we understand what is happening on the farm that affects their conditions of work. In 1977 the average number of acres per farm in New York State was 197. The mean number of acres per farm on the 36 farms where we obtained interviews with the farmers of the study was 363 acres owned and 578 acres operated. These farms are much larger than the average New York State farm. They have added an average of 116 acres each in the past ten years. There is a range in sizes of farms owned from no land owned to 1700 acres.

The 36 farms of the study have been in the hands of their present operators for many years and in the hands of the family of the operator for many more. Only 36 percent of all farms had been in the operator's hands for ten years or fewer. Only 8 percent had been in the operator's family for ten years or fewer; 55 percent had been in the operator's family for over forty years, and three of the farms had been in the family for over one hundred years. This suggests that there is a long family farming tradition among these farmers, great stability over time, and a great commitment to farming (see Tables 1 and 2).

Nonetheless, changes are occurring. Sixty-one percent of the farmers knew of farms in their area that had changed hands in the last ten years, and 31 percent knew of farms that had gone out of business. Twenty-five percent knew of farms that had stopped raising various crops, and three percent knew of farms that had introduced new crops. Sixteen of the farmers in the study (44 percent) stated that there are crops that they no longer

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF YEARS FARM OPERATED BY FARMER

	Number of Farmers	Percent
Missing	1	3
0 - 5	5	14
6 - 10	8	22
11 - 15	4	11
16 - 20	5	14
21 - 25	5	14
26 - 30	3	8
31 and over	5	14
TOTAL	36	100

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF YEARS FARM OPERATED BY FARMER'S FAMILY

	Number of Farmers	Percent
Missing or Not Applicable	2	6
0 - 10	3	8
11 - 20	1	3
21 - 30	4	11
31 - 40	6	17
41 - 50	5	14
51 - 60	7	19
61 - 70	2	6
71 - 80	3	8
100 and over	3	8
TOTAL	36	100

raise. These included a great variety of products--corn, snap beans, wheat, pears, sweet cherries, cabbage, strawberries, raspberries, radishes, cauliflower, celery, peaches, prunes, broccoli, hay and grain--but the only one named by as many as six farmers (17 percent) was tomatoes. Four farmers stated that they had added new crops in the last five years, and six farmers added new crops in the last ten years. The crops added were alfalfa, wheat, oats, strawberries, cauliflower, peppers, melons, prunes, corn, soybeans, peas and flag. Changes thus seem to be more in the direction of dropping crops than adding them (see Table 3).

An important element in the labor picture is the use of local labor. Only 11 percent of the farmers use no full-time local persons as seasonal labor. Thirty-one percent use from 1 to 5 seasonal laborers, but five farmers use 25 or more such workers; one of these uses 45 persons, and one uses 200. This is obviously relevant to the present situation and the future of the use of migrant farm workers (see Table 4).

Sixty-nine percent of the farmers reported using year-round workers. However, only 2 farmers (6 percent) said that year-round workers are doing jobs formerly performed by migrant workers. The year-round workers apparently provide no competition for migrant farmworkers at this time (see Table 5).

An issue that bears on the future of migrant farmworker jobs in the area is the substitution of machines or chemicals for migrant workers. Only 14 percent of the farmers said that jobs had been eliminated because of machines or chemicals in the last five years, but 40 percent said jobs had been eliminated for these reasons in the last ten years. Such figures give only limited comfort to those who might interpret them as meaning a stable situation. Two farmers had eliminated about 100 jobs each in this way, one had eliminated 70 jobs, one had eliminated 67, and two had eliminated 50. This adds up to 437 jobs eliminated by these six farmers. The other farmers had eliminated fewer jobs (see Table 6).

TABLE 3

CHANGES IN FARMING IN THE AREA IN THE LAST 10 YEARS

Questions Indicating Neighborhood Changes	Farmers		
	Number Yes	Percent*	Not Applicable or Missing
Are there farmers that have changed in the area?	22	61	8
Are there farms in the area that have gone out of business?	11	31	8
Are there farms that have changed crops?	9	25	12
Is there a crop you no longer raise?	16	44	0
Are there new crops you have added?	10	28	1

*36 = 100 percent

TABLE 4

NUMBER OF SEASONAL FULL-TIME LOCAL WORKERS USED

Number of Seasonal Full-Time Local Workers	Number of Farmers Using	Percent
Missing	4	11
0	4	11
1 - 5	11	31
6 - 10	6	17
11 - 20	6	17
25 and over	5	14
TOTAL	36	100

TABLE 5

FARMERS' USE OF YEAR-ROUND WORKERS

	Farmers	
	Yes	Percent*
Number using year-round workers	25	69
Do year-round workers do post-migrant jobs?	2	6

*36 = 100 percent

TABLE 6

NUMBER OF MIGRANT FARMWORKER JOBS LOST TO MACHINES OR CHEMICALS

Number of Jobs Lost	In the last 5 years		In the last 10 years	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Missing	1	3	5	14
0	30	83	17	47
1 - 5	3	8	2	6
6 - 10			4	11
11 - 20	1	3	3	8
50	1	3	1	3
67			1	3
70			1	3
100			2	6
TOTAL	36	100	36	100

However, there are some elements of stability in the use of migrant farmworkers. Sixty-nine percent of the farmers said they had used migrant workers for more than 2[illegible] years (see Table 7). Nearly all farmers stated they planned to use migrant farmworkers not only for the next year, but for the next ten years (see Table 8).

This does not mean that they will be using the same number of workers, however. Changes leading to a decreased use of migrant farmworkers were anticipated by 44 percent of the farmers. Past changes in use of labor may indicate something about changes to come. Thirty-three percent stated that they have had crop changes leading to decreased use of migrants. Among reasons given for decreased use are: a crop was discontinued; plastic mulch introduced; cut in acreage; new equipment such as a mechanical harvester; a change to use of local labor. Crops named as involving fewer migrants were apples (1), sweet cherries (3), tomatoes, (2), potatoes (1), cucumbers (1), and melons (2). Balancing this, 33 percent stated that a crop change had led to increased use of migrants. The crops involved were apples (11) and cucumbers (1). In most cases increased need for workers arose from increased production or increased acreage (see Table 9).

Only 14 percent of the farmers used migrant labor for only a single crop, 19 percent used it for two crops, and 33 percent for three crops; 7 farmers (19 percent) used migrant labor for 5 or more crops (see Table 10). Tree fruits are particularly important in using such labor. Of the farmers interviewed, 72 percent were using migrant labor for apples, 42 percent for sweet cherries, 31 percent for pears, and lesser proportions for peaches, prunes, and sour cherries. Migrants are also used in a great variety of other fruit and vegetable crops (see Table 11). The small number reported in this survey as using migrant labor for potatoes does not give a correct picture because most of the potato farmers were in Wyoming County and

TABLE 7

NUMBER OF YEARS FARMER HAS USED MIGRANT FARMWORKERS

Number of Years	Number of Farmers	Percent
1 - 5	2	6
6 - 10	3	8
12 - 15	2	6
16 - 20	4	11
21 - 30	18	50
31 and over	7	19
TOTAL	36	100

TABLE 8

DO FARMERS PLAN TO USE MIGRANT FARMWORKERS

	Yes	
	Number	Percent*
Next year	34	94
For 5 years	34	94
For 10 years	33	92

*36 = 100 percent

TABLE 9

CHANGES IN FARMING LEADING TO CHANGES IN MIGRANT LABOR USE

	Yes	Percent*
Will there be changes that decrease use?	16	44
Was there a crop change that led to fewer migrants?	12	33
Was there a crop change that led to more migrants?	13	36

*36 = 100 percent

TABLE 10

NUMBER OF CROPS FOR WHICH MIGRANTS ARE USED

Number of Crops	Farmers	
	Number	Percent
Missing	2	6
1	5	14
2	7	19
3	12	33
4	3	8
5	5	14
6	1	3
7	1	3
TOTAL	36	100

TABLE 11

CROPS FOR WHICH FARMERS USE MIGRANT FARMWORKERS

	Using Migrant Workers	
	Number Farmers	Percent of All Farmers (36)
Apples	26	72
Corn	1	3
Snap Beans	1	3
Pears	11	31
Sweet Cherries	15	42
Sour Cherries	2	6
Grapes	2	6
Tomatoes	4	11
Cabbage	6	17
Raspberries	1	3
Potatoes	3	8
Cucumbers	6	17
Cauliflower	1	3
Peppers	1	3
Melons	1	3
Celery	1	3
Peaches	4	11
Prunes	4	11
Flag	1	3
Vegetables (unspecified)	2	6
Fruits (unspecified)	1	3
Hay	1	3
Squash	3	8
Beets	2	6
Berries	1	3
Currants	2	6

interviewing there was not possible this year. One interesting finding is that 56 percent of the farmers interviewed thought that migrant farmworkers need special skills.

An important issue and a puzzling question is the role that crew leaders play in farmer-migrant relations. More information on this question will be presented later, but the farmers' view of the matter is relevant here. Fifty-eight percent of the farmers said they did not use crew leaders. Eleven farmers (31 percent) said they used one crew leader; one farmer used four (see Table 12). Our field personnel noticed that on farms where no registered crew leader was used there would sometimes be an arrangement where a farmer appeared to deal with the migrants largely through one migrant treated as a foreman. On the other hand, 34 farmers (94 percent) reported that either instead of or in addition to working through crew leaders they hired migrant workers individually. Thus only about a third of the farmers reported using crew leaders, and nearly all did not deal exclusively through crew leaders.

How long has the farmer had a relationship with his crew leader? The answers varied widely: 2 farmers had dealt with their crew leader for only one year, 1 for three years, 2 for five years and 5 for ten years or more, including one for 25 years and one for 28 years. While the crew leader plays a role in only about a third of the farms, when he does so his relationship with the farmer can be an enduring one.

Nonetheless, crew leaders have played an important role for many migrants. Sixty-three percent of the migrants reported having worked with one or more crew leaders at some time in their lives. Of the 110 migrants in this group who had worked with a crew leader, 45 percent reported working with only one.

Seventy-five percent of the farmers said they had no complaints about migrant farm labor. Those who had complaints named a variety of problems and in most cases phrased them rather vaguely. There was only one complaint that was made even twice; the rest were made by one farmer each. It would seem, therefore, that there is no systematic basis of complaint.

To summarize: The farmers in the study have comparatively large farms for New York State. They and their families have held these farms for many years. They have used migrant workers for many years and by and large expect to continue to do so. Migrant help is most frequently used for tree fruit crops, but a great variety of crops still require such help. However, mechanical and chemical innovations and crop changes are taking place all the time and have led to decreased use of workers in a substantial number of cases, although some farmers reported increased use of migrants because of increased production or acreage. Changes will doubtless continue, but the stability of the farm holdings and the importance of tree crops also suggests some stability in the use of either migrant workers or some kind of local seasonal farmworkers. While the latter are increasingly used, farmers still tend to believe that the work done requires skill and that migrant farmworkers have this skill. Mechanization is possible, but mechanization of tree crops involves expensive capital investment and requires important changes in marketing of the crop that many farmers are reluctant to make. Registered crew leaders are not used by the majority of these farmers, but most of them have foremen to assist in supervising workers on the job. Nonetheless, crew leaders had at some time played a part in the lives of a majority of the workers interviewed.

Who Are the Migrants?

Over half (57 percent) of the migrants in the sample are black; 31 percent, or almost a third, are Puerto Rican. Of the remaining 22 percent,

one person is white (0.6 percent), 7 percent are Mexican-American, and the remaining 3.4 percent are from other groups, mainly West Indian (see Table 13). One of the recurrent points in this report is that the major ethnic groups differ in important ways: in the crops on which they work, in their work year, and in family composition. Such differences suggest that each group has its own problems to solve and might require different kinds of help.

Only 23 percent of the sample is female (see Table 14). However, this proportion varies across the principal ethnic groups. Half of the 12 Mexican-Americans, 30 percent of the black migrants, and only 4 percent of the Puerto Ricans are women. Since the Puerto Ricans must travel a longer distance at great expense, their recruitment situation is considerably different from that of blacks and Mexican-Americans. This should, of course, have significance for agencies working with families and children of migrants.

In regard to marital status, 43 percent of the migrants were presently married. Of the remaining 55.5 percent, the largest portion (38 percent) had never been married; 17 percent were either separated or divorced (see Table 15). The ethnic groups differ only slightly with respect to marital status; blacks have slightly more presently married and slightly fewer never married than the Puerto Ricans (see Table 16).

Migrant farmworkers in New York are predominantly a young group; 57 percent of the sample were under 31 years old, 77 percent under 41, and only 8 percent were over 50. Again there are ethnic differences. Among the black migrants, 47 percent were under 31; while among the Puerto Ricans, 72 percent were in this age group (see Table 17).

One of the major obstacles that prevents migrants from obtaining other kinds of employment is their lack of formal education. Only 14 percent had completed high school (one person had 13 years of schooling, and two had 14). Another 35 percent had some high school education, which means that 41 percent

TABLE 12

USE OF CREW LEADERS BY FARMERS

Number of Crew Leaders Used	Farmers	
	Number	Percent
Missing	3	8
0	21	58
1	11	31
4	1	3
TOTAL	36	100

TABLE 13

ETHNICITY OF RESPONDENT

	Number Responding	Percent
No Answer	2	1
White	1	1
Black	99	57
Puerto Rican	55	31
Mexican-American	12	7
Other	6	3
TOTAL	175	100

TABLE 14

SEX OF RESPONDENT BY ETHNIC GROUP

	Black		Puerto Rican		Mexican-American
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number*
Male	69	70	53	96	(6)
Female	30	30	2	4	(6)
TOTAL	99	100	55	100	(12)

*Absolute Number

TABLE 15

MARITAL STATUS

	Number Responding	Percent
No answer	2	1
Married	76	43
Divorced	11	6
Separated	19	11
Never Married	67	38
TOTAL	175	100

TABLE 16

ETHNIC GROUP OF RESPONDENTS BY MARITAL STATUS

	Black		Puerto Rican		Mexican-American
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number*
Married	47	(47)	19	(35)	(6)
Divorced	5	(5)	4	(7)	(0)
Separated	14	(14)	3	(6)	(0)
Never Married	32	(32)	28	(52)	(6)
TOTAL	99	100	54	100	12

*Absolute Number

TABLE 17

ETHNIC GROUP OF RESPONDENTS BY AGE GROUP

	Black		Puerto Rican		Mexican-American
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number*
20 or under	15	(15)	14	(26)	(5)
21 to 30	32	(32)	25	(46)	(4)
31 to 40	21	(21)	10	(18)	(2)
41 to 50	19	(19)	5	(9)	(1)
Over 50	12	(12)	1	(2)	(0)
TOTAL	99	100	55	100	12

*Absolute Number

had only an eighth grade education or less. A question that cannot be answered here is what this means in terms of functional literacy, but these percentages indicate that a substantial portion lack the basic skills needed in most kinds of employment today. There was little difference among the ethnic groups in regard to educational attainment (see Table 18).

Fifty-five percent of the respondents were born in the continental United States (Table 19). These U.S.-born migrants were from 10 southern states--Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia--and 5 northern or western states--New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Michigan and South Dakota. Within this category, 66 percent were born in either Alabama, Georgia or Florida. Thirty-one percent of the migrants were born in Puerto Rico (see Table 20). Of the 13 percent foreign-born, 7 percent are now United States citizens and 6 percent are not.

In regard to their present residence, a somewhat different picture emerges. First, 99 percent stated that they do indeed have a permanent address. Fifty-nine percent of the group gave a Florida address, only 2 percent an Alabama or Georgia residence. Six percent said they lived in Texas, and 28 percent live in Puerto Rico. For the remaining 5 percent, New York, Colorado and Mexico were the permanent addresses (see Table 21).

During five months of the year, from January through May, about 90 percent of the migrants are at their permanent address. For three more months--June, November and December--74 to 81 percent are at their permanent address. During July and October about 40 percent are there, but during the peak of the season--August and September--less than 25 percent are at their permanent address. This shows that most migrants do have periods of settled living. Moreover, the vast majority of them work as migrants in only a small number of states (see Tables 22 and 23).

TABLE 18

HIGHEST GRADE COMPLETED

	Number Responding	Percent
No answer	16	9
0 - 3	16	9
4 - 6	37	21
7 - 8	20	11
9 - 11	61	35
12 +	25	14
TOTAL	175	100

TABLE 19

CITIZENSHIP

	Number Responding	Percent
No answer	2	1
Born in the United States	97	55
Born in Puerto Rico	55	31
Foreign-born U.S. citizen	9	6
Foreign born, not U.S. citizen	12	7
TOTAL	175	100

TABLE 20

BIRTH PLACE OF RESPONDENT

	Number Responding	Percent
Missing	4	3
Alabama	12	7
Arkansas	3	2
Florida	33	19
Georgia	17	10
Michigan	1	1
Mississippi	3	2
New Jersey	2	1
New York	1	1
North Carolina	2	1
Pennsylvania	1	1
South Carolina	6	3
South Dakota	1	1
Tennessee	2	1
Texas	8	5
Virginia	2	1
Puerto Rico	55	31
Mexico	4	2
Jamaica	14	8
Bahama	3	2
Trinidad	1	1
TOTAL	175	100

Percentages do not total due to rounding

TABLE 21

STATE OF PERMANENT ADDRESS

	Number Responding	Percent
No answer	1	1
Alabama	1	1
Colorado	1	1
Florida	103	59
Georgia	3	2
New York	5	3
Texas	10	6
Puerto Rico	49	28
Mexico	2	1
TOTAL	175	100

Percentages do not total due to rounding

TABLE 22

NUMBER AT PRESENT ADDRESS IN VARIOUS MONTHS IN THE LAST YEAR

	Not Applicable	Number	Percent Yes	Total
January	4	160	91	175
February	4	162	93	175
March	4	160	91	175
April	4	157	90	175
May	4	155	89	175
June	4	130	74	175
July	4	69	39	175
August	4	37	21	175
September	5	40	23	175
October	5	72	41	175
November	5	131	75	175
December	6	142	81	175

Those with permanent addresses in Florida, Georgia and Alabama reported spending longer periods of time there, 77 percent spending eight or more months a year at home, whereas only 60 percent of the Puerto Ricans and 44 percent of the migrants from other places stayed at their permanent addresses for a comparable amount of time (see Table 24).

These findings with regard to permanent address indicate that there are several points of origin for migrants working in New York. This is particularly important in regard to interstate programs and future planning for migrant farmworkers in New York. There is, for example, conflicting evidence from different parts of the country as to the extent to which migrant labor streams actually describe the yearly movement of farmworkers. If most of the migrants in Western and Central New York do come from a small number of states where they spend substantial amounts of time, this suggests possibilities for program planning and interstate cooperation which would be impossible if migrants were more dispersed during the rest of the year. The concentration of New York's migrants in a limited number of states during the rest of the year suggests that, for better or worse, during a substantial part of the year the migrants' problems really must be solved elsewhere (see Tables 22 and 23).

What are the migrants' families like? A substantial portion of the sample--86 percent--have at least one other family member in their household. Only 21 percent have no other adults in the household; 35 percent have two or more other adults in the family. At the other extreme, 40 percent report five or more family members (Table 25). A majority have a spouse, son, daughter, mother or brother living with them; nearly half have a sister, and 20 percent reported a father as part of their household. Smaller proportions reported grandparents, in-laws, nieces, nephews, aunts, uncles, friends and others (Table 26). However, there are significant differences between

TABLE 23

NUMBER OF MONTHS AT PERMANENT ADDRESS

	Number Responding	Percent
0 - 3	9	5
4 - 6	19	11
7 - 9	92	53
10 - 12	55	31
TOTAL	175	100

TABLE 24

NUMBER OF MONTHS AT HOME ADDRESS BY PERMANENT RESIDENCE

	Texas	Fla., Ga., Ala.		Puerto Rico		Other
	Number*	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	(*)
0 to 7 months	(6)	25	23	20	41	(5)
8 or 9 months	(3)	46	43	13	27	(2)
10 or 12 months	(1)	36	34	16	33	(2)
TOTAL	10	107	100	49	100	9

*Absolute Number

TABLE 25

NUMBER OF OTHER MEMBERS IN MIGRANT'S HOUSEHOLD

Number of Family Members	Total Family Members		Total Children		Total Adults	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0 (members)	25	14	57	33	36	21
1	21	12	22	13	80	46
2	18	10	23	13	29	17
3	18	10	21	12	16	9
4	24	14	24	14	8	5
5	19	11	7	4	5	3
6	15	9	5	3	1	1
7	16	9	10	6	0	0
8 +	19	11	6	3	0	0
Total	175	100	175	100	175	100

TABLE 26

PERCENT OF MIGRANTS WHO HAVE VARIOUS RELATIVES AS MEMBERS OF THEIR HOUSEHOLD

	Number Responding	Percent*
Spouse	75	43
Son	55	31
Daughter	52	30
Mother	57	33
Father	35	20
Grandparents	5	3
In-laws	7	4
Niece/Nephew	14	8
Friend	5	3
Sister	47	27
Brother	50	29
Aunt/Uncle	5	3
Cousin	2	1
Other	14	8

*175 migrants = 100 percent

ethnic groups in regard to family composition. The Puerto Ricans more often tended to have their mother, father, sister or brother as part of their households. This reflects the somewhat younger age of the Puerto Rican migrants, but it probably also reflects a cultural trait--a greater tendency to live in extended family groups. Thirty-three percent had no children. The other 67 percent had a total of 412 children. However, only 20 percent of these had accompanied their parents to New York State (see Table 27).

Again, there are clear ethnic differences; Tables 28, 29, and 30 show that Puerto Ricans and Mexican-Americans tend to have larger families, are less frequently childless, and more often have two or more other adults in the family. This supports the inference that the Puerto Rican and Mexican-American farmworkers more often are part of large extended families, at least in comparison to black migrants. Overall, these figures suggest that migrants are, by and large, family people. Those that have children average 3 children per family and have other adults in their households to share family responsibilities. These responsibilities are great, and especially so in relation to their annual income, as will be discussed later.

Beginning Work in New York

Problems inherent in a migrant's work situation are how to find a farm on which to work, how to get there, how to pay for transportation costs, how to have money while waiting to work, and how much debt is thus incurred. If one's work situation is frequently disrupted, if one frequently has to pack up and move to another job, the whole process, cost and inconvenience of frequently relocating plays an important part in one's life.

The migrant workers were asked who decided on what farm they worked. The answer tended to be the worker or the head of his family--in 41 percent

TABLE 27

PERCENT HAVING RELATIVE AS PART OF HOUSEHOLD, BY ETHNIC GROUP

	Puerto Ricans		Blacks	
	Number	Percent*	Number	Percent**
Mother	32	58	18	18
Father	19	35	9	9
Sister	27	49	14	14
Brother	31	56	12	12

* 55 = 100 percent
** 99 = 100 percent

TABLE 28

NUMBER OF FAMILY MEMBERS BY ETHNICITY

Number of Family Members	Ethnic Group: Black		Puerto Rican		Mexican-American
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
0 or 1 member	37	37	4	7	0
2 or 3 members	24	24	7	13	4
4 or 5 members	20	20	19	35	2
6 or more	18	18	25	46	6
Total	99	100	55	100	12

TABLE 29

NUMBER OF ADULT FAMILY MEMBERS BY ETHNICITY

Number of Adult Members	Ethnic Group				
	Black		Puerto Rican		Mexican-American
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
No others	24	24	8	15	1
1 other	53	54	18	33	4
2 or more	22	22	29	53	7
Total	99	100	55	100	12

TABLE 30

NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN FAMILY, BY ETHNICITY

Number of Children	Ethnic Group				
	Black		Puerto Rican		Mexican-American
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
No child	41	41	11	20	0
1 or 2	26	26	13	24	5
3 or 4	21	21	19	35	2
5 or more	11	11	12	22	5
Total	99	100	55	100	12

of the cases. Twenty-three percent named the crew leader and 34 percent a variety of others. Thus the crew leader plays a role in this choice in only a minority of cases (see Table 31).

Seventy percent of migrant workers reported that they traveled to New York with other workers (see Table 32). Of the migrants who traveled in a group, 39 percent reported that a crew leader organized the group (see Table 33). Also, 52 percent of those traveling with others stated that their group consisted partially or completely of relatives (see Table 34). The workers had reached camp from their last location by a variety of means of travel: 27 percent had driven their own car, 20 percent a friend's or relative's car, totalling 47 percent who had arrived by means of a private car. Three percent had come on a commercial bus, and 29 percent by air (mostly from Puerto Rico). Three percent had come by other means. This leaves 13 percent who had come in their crew leader's car and 5 percent more in a group on a crew leader's bus or truck, for a total of 18 percent of the migrants whose transportation to the camp had been provided by the crew chief (see Table 35).

How is the transportation paid for? In 72 percent of the cases, the migrant had paid for his transportation with his own money. Ten percent had had an advance from their employer for this purpose, and 1 percent had been given free transportation by the employer. Four percent had paid for their transportation with an advance from the crew leader, and 5 percent said their transportation had been provided free by the crew leader. Thus, for 13 percent the transportation was paid for by someone else (see Table 36).

Thirty-seven percent of the migrants (65 persons) had gone into debt while waiting for work to begin. They had waited an average of 5.3 days to begin work and had to finance themselves during this waiting period. The debt incurred by this group averaged $111. Forty-nine percent of the group in debt had incurred this debt for food, 23 percent for transportation, and

TABLE 31

WHO DECIDES WHICH FARMS TO WORK ON?

Person Deciding on Farm	Migrants	
	Number	Percent
Missing	3	2
Crew leader	40	23
Respondent	51	29
Family heads	21	12
Someone else	60	34
TOTAL	175	100

TABLE 32

DOES WORKER TRAVEL TO NEW YORK WITH OTHER WORKERS?

	Migrants	
	Number	Percent
Yes	122	70
No	49	28
Depends on location	3	2
Missing	1	1
TOTAL	175	100

TABLE 33

IS THE GROUP ORGANIZED BY A CREW CHIEF?

	Migrants	
	Number	Percent
Missing or inapplicable	45	26
Yes	51	29
No	77	44
Depends on location	2	1
TOTAL	175	100

TABLE 34

TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE TRAVELING GROUP CONSIST OF RELATIVES?

	Migrants	
	Number	Percent
Missing or inapplicable	31	18
All	17	10
Some	58	33
None	69	39
TOTAL	175	100

TABLE 35

HOW THE MIGRANT WORKERS TRAVELED TO THE PRESENT JOB FROM THE LAST

Method of travel	Migrants	
	Number	Percent
Own vehicle	48	27
Friend or relative's car	35	20
Crew chief's vehicle	22	13
Group on crew bus/truck	9	5
Commercial bus	5	3
Air	50	29
Other	6	3
TOTAL	175	100

TABLE 36

HOW THE RESPONDENT PAID FOR TRANSPORTATION TO NEW YORK

	Migrants	
	Number	Percent
Missing	1	1
Own money	126	72
Advance from employer	17	10
Provided free by farm	2	1
Advance from crew chief	7	4
Provided by crew chief free	9	5
Paid by someone else	13	7
TOTAL	175	100

28 percent for unstated reasons--they simply said that they had no money and presumably needed it for a variety of expenses (see Table 37).

From whom does the migrant borrow? Of those in debt, 26 percent had borrowed from a friend or relative, 28 percent had borrowed from the farmer they were working for, and 3 percent from the company or plant where they were working. Fourteen percent had borrowed from their crew leader, and 12 percent from other sources. Again we find the crew leader playing a minor role in solving this problem, the most frequent source of funds being the farmer. A principal reason for this debt is the irregularity of the migrant's work year. Only 46 percent of the migrants had been working just before coming to the camp at which they were interviewed (see Table 38).

Problems of Camp Living

One of the major concerns for migrants is their housing situation while away from home. Housing is regulated by law, and camps are inspected by the Department of Health and sometimes by the Department of Labor. Because the migrants do not have control over camp housing, any alteration would have to be achieved by negotiating with the farmer who owns the camp. The complexities of evaluating housing simply went beyond the descriptive purpose of this study; therefore, no information concerning housing conditions was included in the survey.

The camp is not always situated near the work situation, and therefore local transportation to work often has to be found. Thirty-five percent said they walked to their job site; the remaining 60 percent from whom we had responses said they went by some other means--42 percent by car or bus, 14 percent by truck, 1 percent by hitchhiking (see Table 39). Of those riding in cars, buses, or trucks, 31 percent said they owned the vehicle, 13 percent said the farm operator did, 26 percent said it was owned by the crew leader, and 30 percent named a variety of other persons (see Table 40).

TABLE 37

WHY THE MIGRANT WORKERS WENT INTO DEBT

Reason	Migrants	
	Number	Percent
Transportation	15	23
Food	32	49
No money	14	22
Other	4	6
TOTAL	65	100

TABLE 38

WHO RESPONDENT OWES

Person owed	Migrants	
	Number	Percent
Friend	11	17
Relative	6	9
The farmer	18	28
Company or plant	2	3
Crew chief	9	14
Other	8	12
Missing	11	12
TOTAL	65	100

TABLE 39

HOW MIGRANTS GOT TO WORK IN THE FIELD FROM THE CAMP

	Number	Percent
Missing	8	5
Car	49	28
Bus	24	14
Truck	25	14
Hitchhike	2	1
Walk	62	35
Other	5	3
Total	175	100

TABLE 40

WHO PROVIDED CAR, BUS OR TRUCK

Persons supplying car or truck	Migrants	
	Number	Percent
Respondent	30	31
Farm Operator	13	13
Crew Leader	25	26
Other	29	30
Total	97	100

Since the camps are typically in isolated rural areas, other needs for local transportation arise--to buy food and do other shopping, to go to the health clinic, etc. The migrant most often goes in his own or a friend's car--in 50 percent of the cases for the health clinic, 56 percent for food shopping, and 67 percent for other shopping. A small percent use bus service for these purposes. Agencies provided transportation to the health clinic for 11 percent, but they do not help with transportation for shopping. Nine percent said they walked to food shopping, and 14 percent to other shopping. Their crew leader provided transportation to the health clinic for 15 percent of the group, for food shopping for 10 percent, and for other shopping for 9 percent, and this service was usually free. Their employer provided transportation for 10 percent for the health clinic, 6 percent for food, and 3 percent for other shopping. (See Table 41.)

Seventy-one percent of the migrants said they cooked their own breakfast and lunch, and 73 percent their own dinner. Most of the rest ate in the commissary, some 23 percent (see Table 42). Thirteen migrants (7 percent) said they supplemented their food by growing a vegetable plot.

In solving problems and in reaching agencies, the question of whether the migrant has access to a telephone is an important one, since the worker is located in a remote area, works long hours, and much of the time depends on others for transportation. Thirty-eight percent of the migrants stated that they did not have access to a telephone. This certainly presents a communication problem. Having an emergency Hot Line telephone number that migrants could call with a critical problem is a good idea; however, those without a phone obviously cannot utilize this help. Moreover, only 4 percent of the migrants stated that they know the Hot Line number.

TABLE 41

WHO PROVIDES LOCAL TRANSPORTATION FOR HEALTH CLINIC, FOOD, AND SHOPPING

	Health Clinic		Food Store		Other Shopping	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Missing or not applicable	5	3	23	13	5	3
Own Car	41	23	48	27	49	28
Friends Car free	28	16	28	16	39	22
Friends Car pay	19	11	22	13	29	17
Bus	3	2	9	5	5	3
Provided by agency	20	11	0	0	0	0
Provided by employer	17	10	10	6	5	3
Crew Chief's car free	25	14	16	9	14	8
Crew Chief's car pay	2	1	1	1	2	1
Walk	0	0	15	9	24	14
Other	15	9	3	2	3	2
TOTAL	175	100	175	100	175	100

TABLE 42

WHERE THE MIGRANTS GET THEIR MEALS

	Breakfast		Lunch		Dinner	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Missing	5	3	4	2	3	2
Cook own	125	71	125	71	128	73
Commissary	41	23	41	23	41	23
Other	4	2	5	3	3	2
TOTAL	175	100	175	100	175	100

The Yearly Round of Employment and Crop Work

The migrant workers spend a relatively small part of their year in New York State, and most of that time they are working. They typically arrive a few days before they are able to start work, but once they start, barring breaks in the work schedule due to such factors as weather, they keep on working typically until it is time to leave. Table 43 shows months spent in New York and elsewhere, employed and unemployed. Responses were rounded off to the nearest month, since many migrants replied only in terms of months and no more refined estimate of work time was warranted by the data. Nonetheless, the table shows that on the average a much smaller proportion of the time spent out of New York was employment time than in New York. This is especially true for those working in processing. They spend a relatively longer time than other groups (except those working on vegetable crops) in the state of New York, but spend only a small proportion of time out of New York working--an average of 2.35 months. (These calculations include Saturdays and Sundays as well as work time.) Table 44 shows that the Puerto Rican workers, the majority of whom work in processing jobs, show this pattern of working in the state for a relatively longer period and working a comparatively small proportion of time out of the state. Thus the money earned in New York comprises a substantial part of their yearly income.

Workers in crops spend less time in New York and work a much larger proportion of the time that they are out of the state. Most of these workers are blacks from the south who work on apples, other tree fruit, and vegetables, including potatoes. The Puerto Ricans work roughly one-fourth of their time out of New York, the other workers around two-thirds of the time. (See Tables 43 and 44.)

TABLE 43

AVERAGE NUMBER OF MONTHS SPENT IN NEW YORK AND OUT OF NEW YORK, EMPLOYED AND UNEMPLOYED BY CROP WORKED ON LAST WEEK

	MEAN NUMBER OF MONTHS				
Major Crop Group	In NY	Employed in NY	Out of NY	Employed Out of NY	Number of Workers
Apples	2.70	2.45	9.30	6.45	44
Other tree fruit	2.42	2.34	9.58	7.00	26
Potatoes	1.85	1.85	10.15	7.62	13
Vegetables other than potatoes	4.13	3.95	7.87	4.76	39
Processing	3.57	3.35	8.43	2.35	37
All respondents*	3.12	2.96	8.88	5.16	169

*Missing 7, or 4 percent.

TABLE 44

AVERAGE NUMBER OF MONTHS* SPENT IN NEW YORK AND OUT OF NEW YORK, EMPLOYED AND UNEMPLOYED, BY ETHNIC GROUP

	Mean Number of Months				
Ethnic Group	Spent in N.Y.	Employed in N.Y.	Spent Outside N.Y.	Employed Outside N.Y.	No.
Black	2.50	2.29	9.50	6.69	98
Puerto Rican	4.04	3.78	7.96	2.31	55
All respondents**	3.11	2.90	8.89	5.15	174

*Rounded out to nearest whole month
**Missing 1, or 0.6 percent.

Half of the migrants (51 percent) said New York State had been part of their yearly round of activity for 5 years or more, and one-fourth (25 percent) of them said they had been coming to the state for 10 years or more. Table 45 shows that new migrants are entering the work force every year, however, and the 49 percent that have been working in the state less than 5 years may be the result of a considerable turnover among the younger people.

Fifty-eight percent of the migrants interviewed said they would leave New York sometime during the month of November; 23 percent expected to leave in October, only 6 percent during August or September, and 5 percent in December. (See Table 46.) This conforms roughly with their statements about the number of months spent at their permanent residence.

Table 47 shows the relation between ethnic group and the job the worker had spent most time on during the survey week. All processing was done by Puerto Ricans, a few of whom also worked on vegetables other than potatoes and on strawberries and melons. All of the 12 Mexican-Americans worked on vegetables other than potatoes. Black migrants worked on a number of crops: apples (45 percent), other tree fruit (23 percent), potatoes (14 percent), and other vegetables (18 percent). The different ethnic groups tend to have their specialties in crop work, and the time they spend in New York is largely dependent on the needs of these various crops.

Table 48 shows more clearly the specialization of migrant workers in different types of crops. People working on vegetable crops in the week prior to the interview occasionally had worked on other crops in New York State, particularly apples, and apple and other tree fruit workers seem relatively interchangeable. Otherwise it is the rare person who has worked on a crop other than his or her specialty in the last year.

TABLE 45

NUMBER OF YEARS RESPONDENT HAS WORKED IN NEW YORK

Number of Years Worked in New York	Migrants	
	Number	Percent
0	2	1
1	29	17
2	16	9
3	21	12
4	17	10
5-9	45	26
10-14	21	12
15-19	9	5
20-24	4	2
25-29	6	4
30 or more	4	2
Missing	1	1
Total	175	100

Percentages do not total due to rounding.

TABLE 46

WHEN MIGRANT WORKERS EXPECT TO LEAVE NEW YORK THIS YEAR

Expect to Leave New York	Migrants	
	Number	Percent
August	3	2
September	7	4
Sometime in October	1	1
1st week in October	4	2
2nd week in October	15	9
3rd week in October	10	6
4th week in October	8	5
Sometime in November	9	5
1st week in November	26	15
2nd week in November	31	18
3rd week in November	26	15
4th week in November	8	5
December	9	5
March	1	1
Missing	17	10
Total	175	100

Percentages do not total due to rounding.

TABLE 47

CROP WORKED ON DURING SURVEY WEEK, BY ETHNIC GROUP

Major Crop Worked on During Survey Week	Migrants							
	Black		Puerto Rican		Mexican-American	Other Ethnic Groups	All Ethnic Groups	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Number	Number	Percent
Apples	42	45	0	0	0	3	45	27
Other tree fruit	22	23	0	0	0	4	26	15
Potatoes	13	14	0	0	0	0	13	8
Vegetables (other than potatoes)	17	18	17	18	12	0	39	23
Processing	0	0	37	67	0	0	37	22
Strawberries and melons	0	0	6	11	0	1	7	4
Other farm jobs	0	0	2	4	0	0	2	1
Total	94	100	55	100	12	8	169	100

Missing 6

TABLE 48

CROPS WORKED ON IN NEW YORK STATE IN THE PAST YEAR AND IN THE PAST WEEK

Crops Worked on in Past Year in N.Y.	Crops Worked on in the Past Week (Number of Migrants)						
	Apples	Other Tree Fruit	Potatoes	Other Vegetables	Processing	Strawberries and Melons	Other Farm Jobs
Apples	44	16	0	8	0	1	0
Other tree fruit	7	24	0	2	0	0	0
Potatoes	1	1	13	1	1	0	0
Other vegetables	0	3	1	35	0	0	0
Processing	0	0	0	1	36	1	0
Strawberries and melons	0	0	0	2	0	7	0
Other farm jobs	6	1	0	2	0	0	1
Total number* working on crop this week	45	26	13	39	37	7	2

Missing 6

*Columns do not add up to total, since each worker may have worked on more than one crop in the year.

For most of the migrant workers, the yearly round of agricultural work includes only the home state and New York. There are only traces of the East Coast stream of migrant labor that used to include stops in one or more other states along the coast performing work on crops and moving North with the season. Only nineteen workers, or 11 percent, said they worked in even one state other than New York and their home state. Only one person had stopped in two other states. Seven workers had stopped in Maryland, where they worked on tomatoes and cucumbers (and one on potatoes). Five workers had stopped in New Jersey, four working on onions and one on tomatoes. Two workers had stopped in South Carolina, one for watermelons, the other for tomatoes. One worker each had stopped in Alabama, Tennessee, North Dakota, and Mexico (the latter for cattle herding). A total of seven workers had worked on tomatoes between New York and their home state, two on cucumbers and three on both tomatoes and cucumbers. Four reported working on onions.

Sixteen of these nineteen workers were black, one Puerto Rican, and two Mexican-American. All but two had Florida as their permanent home, and one of the two others was moving to Florida at the end of the season. The nineteenth worker lives in Mexico. Thus there is a trace of the former East Coast Stream of migrant workers; a few stop between Florida and New York to work mostly on tomatoes, cucumbers and onions. While in New York, 12 of the 19 work on potatoes, 5 on cucumbers, and 3 on apples, and 1 on cabbage.

The farm jobs the migrants perform outside New York, however, relate to the types of crops they work on when they are in New York. Table 49 shows the crops worked on in New York by the crops worked on out of the state. A migrant may have worked on no other farm job, one job or several. Table 49 shows that of the 45 picking apples in the last week, 29 migrants had picked citrus in the last year, 6 had picked other tree fruit, 1 had

TABLE 49

CROPS WORKED ON IN NEW YORK STATE IN THE PAST WEEK AND CROPS WORKED ON OUTSIDE NEW YORK IN THE PAST YEAR

Crops Worked on in Past Year Outside N.Y.	Crop Worked on in New York in the Past Week (Number)						
	Apples	Other Tree Fruit	Potatoes	Other Vegetables	Processing	Strawberries and Melons	Other Farm Jobs
Citrus	29	14	4	13	0	0	0
Other fruit	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Potatoes	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Other vegetables	1	1	13	8	0	0	0
Sugar	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
Coffee	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Bananas	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Tobacco	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Other farm jobs	6	2	3	2	0	2	0
Total number* working on crop this week	45	26	13	39	37	7	2

Missing 6

*Columns do not add up to total, since each worker may have no out of state farm job or work more than one.

picked other vegetables, and 6 had other farm jobs. Similarly, 14 of those who picked other tree fruit had picked citrus out of state. All of the potato workers had worked on other vegetables out of state; 4 had also worked on citrus, and 3 on other farm jobs. The vegetable workers worked out of state on citrus, vegetables, and occasional other crops. The processing workers seldom worked on farm jobs when out of New York State. They are Puerto Ricans and apparently seldom get involved in farm work in Puerto Rico. Thus, on the whole the migrants tend to maintain their work specialties when out of state to a large extent, though citrus draws many ethnic groups, since that appears to be the opportunity most available.

Table 50 shows the number of persons in each of the three main ethnic groups who have worked on each crop in and out of New York State in the past year. This again shows the crop specialization of these groups. The Mexican-Americans work at vegetables, and a few at apples and citrus. The Puerto Ricans work at processing, vegetables, strawberries and melons in New York, and a few on other crops; out of New York State an occasional person works on any of a number of crops. The black workers specialize in tree crops in and out of New York, and to a lesser extent in vegetables and potatoes, both in and outside of the state.

Nonfarm work plays a comparatively small part in the lives of the migrant workers. Only 29 percent had a nonfarm job during the year (among the black migrants, 29 percent, and among the Puerto Ricans, 33 percent). One Mexican-American had a nonfarm job, as did one Indian and one white migrant. Ten percent of the migrants had a nonfarm job for at least seven months of the year; 16 percent had a nonfarm job for four or more months. Thus even among the minority who held nonfarm jobs, it was seldom for a long period. They held a wide variety of unskilled or low-skilled jobs. The job held by the greatest number was construction work of some kind. A number

TABLE 50

CROPS WORKED ON IN AND OUT OF NEW YORK, BY ETHNIC GROUP

All Jobs Worked on in Past Year	Ethnic Group (Number of Migrants)		
	Black	Puerto Rican	Mexican American
In New York State:			
Apples	59	1	4
Other tree fruit	28	2	0
Potatoes	15	1	1
Other vegetables	21	7	12
Processing Strawberries and melons	0	38	0
Other farm jobs	0	8	0
	5	3	0
Outside New York State:			
Citrus	49	0	5
Other tree fruit	7	0	0
Potatoes	1	0	0
Other vegetables	19	2	2
Sugar	1	2	0
Coffee	0	2	0
Bananas	0	1	0
Tobacco	0	1	0
Other farm jobs	13	1	1
Total number* migrants in ethnic groups	99	55	12

*Number of persons performing jobs do not add up to number in group, since any migrant may have performed one or more jobs in the last year.

held various kinds of helper jobs--auto mechanic, plumber, electrician's helper. A number held jobs in restaurants, two worked as a maid or a nurse's aide. There was occasional, but only occasional, mention of factory work; this seemed to play a very small part in the migrants' work picture. The greater proportion of nonfarm jobs were hourly jobs in unskilled or low-skilled labor and often low-paying areas of work.

In summary, the yearly round of work for most migrant farmworkers consists of a short period of a few months in New York State, with most of the year spent at some home base. A small proportion work on farming somewhere between New York and the home state, a trace of the former migrant worker stream. Puerto Rican workers come here for a relatively longer time to work for the most part in processing jobs and at a few jobs on other crops. On the average, they are employed for only a quarter of the time they spend in Puerto Rico, and nearly all of that is nonfarm employment. The southern black workers from Florida work on southern crops for relatively longer periods, mostly on citrus and vegetables. Only 29 percent of them reported working on nonfarm jobs during the year. Most migrants specialize in certain types of crops, and they tend to maintain these specialties in and out of New York State.

Income and Earnings

How poor are the migrants? How do they earn their income? How do jobs at which migratory laborers work differ in payment? These are among the most salient questions the study addresses and are also those for which it provides the least satisfactory answers. Family income information exists for only 56 percent of the respondents. Many state that they simply did not know what other members earn throughout the year. Individual income information exists for only 77 percent of the respondents. Even those who

answered often seemed to have only a very rough idea of earnings. Nonetheless, such information is better than none, and differences among groups conform to expectations of those working with the migrants. In thinking about migrant income, one should always remember that their way of life, moving themselves and often their families at least twice a year, entails much expense and dislocation not undergone by the ordinary person.

The mean family income for all respondents who answered was $6,006 (see Table 54). The mean individual income was $4,037. To better understand the meaning of these numbers, one had to compare them with the federal poverty guidelines, as shown in Table 51. Single people had a mean income slightly greater than the minimum recommended income. Families of most other sizes seemed to fall below the recommended figure (except for 3-person families). The larger the family, the more it tended to fall below the minimum recommended income and on the whole income did not increase with family size. In spite of this fact, a later section will show that comparatively small proportions of this group drew on various kinds of federal and local income supplements.

There were substantial differences in income among workers in various crops, as shown in Table 52. The processing workers earned much less on the average than the other groups; it should also be remembered that they are Puerto Ricans and work only a small part of the time that they spend outside of New York. The vegetable workers seemed to earn less than the apple and tree fruit workers.

Since the different ethnic groups work on different crops in New York and have quite different employment situations outside of the state, it is not surprising that they show great differences in income. The Puerto Rican workers have a much smaller (about half) individual and family income compared with black migratory workers (see Table 53). No matter what their

TABLE 51

COMPARISON OF FAMILY INCOME WITH POVERTY INCOME FOR DIFFERENT FAMILIES OF DIFFERENT SIZE

Number of Members in Family	Number of Families	U.S. Dept. of Labor Minimum Recommended Income, 1978	Mean Family Income
1	23	$ 3,925	$4,103
2	15	5,200	4,462
3	13	6,475	8,318
4	13	7,750	6,485
5	13	9,025	5,037
6	9	10,300	8,793
7	6	11,575	7,650
8	5	12,850	6,848
9 or more	6	*	*

No answer 72, or 41 percent

*Numbers too small to report

TABLE 52

CROP WORKED ON THIS WEEK BY INCOME

Crop	Mean Income of Respondent		Mean Income of Respondent's Family as a Whole	
	Number	Income	Number	Income
Processing	22	$2,823	13	$3,108
Apples	41	5,364	36	6,361
Other tree fruit	22	4,484	21	5,515
Potatoes	12	2,792	6	*
Vegetables other than potatoes	29	3,575	21	6,200
For total group	131	3,996	99	5,865

*Omitted because cases so few in number

Missing cases 49, or 28 percent

TABLE 53

INCOME BY ETHNIC GROUP

Ethnic Group	Mean Income of Respondent		Mean Income of Respondent's Family as a Whole	
	Number	Income	Number	Income
Black	85	$4,689	69	$6,610
Puerto Rican	31	2,684	19	3,047
Mexican American	11	2,323	8	7,700
Other	8		7	
Total responding	135	4,037	103	6,006

Missing 40, or 22.9 percent

TABLE 54

INCOME BY SEX OF RESPONDENT

Sex	Mean Income of Respondent		Mean Income of Respondent's Family as a Whole	
	Number	Income	Number	Income
Male	104	$4,144	75	$5,466
Female	31	3,677	28	7,453
Total responding	135	4,037	103	6,006

family size, such an income falls far below U.S. Department of Labor minimum recommended income.

Table 54 shows that males earned more than females in individual income, but it should be remembered that as females are more frequently a part of a family group, their family income is greater than the males'. Those never married (see Table 55) earned less than other groups, probably because they were younger. Table 56 shows individual and family earnings by age groups. Up to the age of 50, income increases with age; for those over 50, income suffers a decline. Income also increases with the number of years spent in New York (see Table 57). Age and experience appear to count.

Table 58 shows the earnings of migrants for those jobs for which more than a very few migrants gave information. The mean hourly wage is given in the case where the hourly wage is known, and the mean piece-work wage where it is known. In the case of the piece-work wage, it should be noted that there is not always a standard unit that all farms use as a basis for payment, nor did we always know what the unit was on which wages are based. A bin of apples may be larger on one farm than on another. Some kind of standardization of the unit used for piece-work payment for each crop using this method could provide migrants with better knowledge of exactly what they are earning and how this compares with earnings on other farms. The mean payments are based in many cases on small numbers of workers and must be treated with great care. The amount is correct as far as we know it, but it could be vastly different for other workers in these crops.

A part of the migrant farmworker's income is paid in the form of extras such as bonuses for work on certain crops, free housing, or free transportation. The migrant workers seldom received such extras outside of New York State. Therefore the analysis is confined to jobs worked on in New York State in the survey year. Each time a job was mentioned by a migrant it was

TABLE 55

INCOME BY MARITAL STATUS

Marital Status	Mean Income of Respondent		Mean Income of Respondent's Family as a Whole	
	Number	Income	Number	Income
Married	59	$4,659	54	$6,376
Divorced	10	4,090	9	4,489
Separated	16	4,888	12	9,050
Never married	48	3,039	27	4,564
Total responding	133	4,059	102	6,044

TABLE 56

INCOME BY AGE GROUP

Age in Years	Mean Income of Respondent		Mean Income of Respondent's Family as a Whole	
	Number	Income	Number	Income
20 or less	26	$2,115	12	$5,445
21 to 30	45	3,493	33	5,340
31 to 40	31	5,345	27	6,704
41 to 50	23	5,967	18	7,624
Over 50	10	2,722	13	4,523
Total responding	135	4,037	103	6,006

TABLE 57

INCOME BY YEARS IN NEW YORK

Years in N.Y.	Mean Income of Respondent		Mean Income of Respondent's Family as a Whole	
	Number	Income	Number	Income
0, 1, or 2	33	$3,304	21	$5,349
3, 4, or 5	41	3,699	31	6,116
6 or more	61	4,660	51	6,209
Total responding	135	4,037	103	6,006

TABLE 58

RESPONDENT'S PAY RATES

**Crop Work	Mean Hourly Wage	Mean Piece Work
Hoeing weeds	$2.91 (15)*	-
Cutting cabbage	-	$ 2.60 (7)
Picking pears	-	10.23 (21)
Cutting suckers	2.84 (14)	-
Picking tomatoes	3.82 (7)	.96 (25)
Picking cucumbers	-	1.15 (19)
Picking oranges	-	3.14 (31)
Picking apples	-	9.15 (61)
Picking grapefruit	-	1.74 (14)
Picking sweet cherries	-	4.84 (16)
Planting cabbage	2.68 (8)	-
Cleaning machinery	3.86 (8)	-

*The figure in the parentheses is the number of respondents upon which the wage estimate is based.

**These are the only jobs for which information exists for more than a very small number of respondents.

counted as one instance for the purpose of Table 59. Thus a migrant could record two apple picking jobs and three vegetable jobs in the course of the year. All jobs mentioned were coded as to whether or not any of the extras were earned, and all appear on Table 59. Thus apple picking jobs were mentioned as occurring 90 times in all by the 175 migrants in the course of the year. Table 59 shows that workers in most of the crops received free housing most of the time, although in processing jobs free housing was provided in only 59 percent of the instances. Smaller proportions receive free transportation and even smaller proportions bonuses (see Table 59). Processing and tree fruit other than apples received bonuses least often. Apple picking jobs received free transportation least often.

The Work Week and the Work Day

The 169 migrant workers who had worked in the week before the interview had worked an average of 4.7 days during that week. They averaged 7.7 hours a day on the days they worked. However, 62 percent of those who worked averaged 8 or more hours a day, and 38 percent averaged 9 or more hours a day. They reported that they had performed 37 different jobs on a wide range of fruit and vegetable crops, including apples, peaches, pears, prunes, strawberries, lettuce, celery, cucumbers, potatoes, corn, tomatoes, cabbage, and watermelon. Many of the jobs were connected with the harvest: picking, digging, crating, boxing, freezing, etc. But migrant workers are also used in many other jobs--thinning, hoeing, picking rocks, irrigating, cutting suckers, and the like. Table 60 shows the crop worked on most in the week prior to the interview. Twenty-six percent had worked on apples, 22 percent on vegetables other than potatoes, and 21 percent in processing plants. Table 61 shows the frequency distribution of the number of days worked in that week. Forty-three percent had worked fewer than 5 days in that week. Thirty-seven percent had worked more than 5 days.

TABLE 59

EXTRA INCOME RECEIVED FOR CROP WORK,
BY CROP WORKED ON IN NEW YORK

Crop Worked	Number of Times Crop Mentioned by All Migrants at Any Time This Year	A Bonus		Free Housing		Free Transportation	
		Number	Percent*	Number	Percent*	Number	Percent*
Apples	90	37	41	76	84	23	26
Other tree fruit	70	11	16	53	76	22	31
Potatoes	21	8	38	20	95	12	57
Vegetables (other than potatoes)	81	24	30	69	85	37	46
Strawberries and melons	8	0	-	8	100	7	88
Processing	56	8	14	33	59	23	41
Number of respondents		37		116		63	

*Percent represents the proportion of the total number of times a crop was worked on during the year that a bonus, housing or transportation was received.

TABLE 60

CROP THE MIGRANT WORKED ON MOST DURING SURVEY WEEK

Crop	Migrants	
	Number	Percent
Processing	37	21
Apples	45	26
Other tree fruit	26	15
Strawberries and melons	7	4
Potatoes	13	7
Other vegetables	39	22
Other farm jobs	2	1
Missing	6	3
TOTAL	175	100

Percent does not total due to rounding.

Twenty-five percent of the workers were supervised by the farmer, 21 percent by a crew leader, 19 percent by a farm manager or farm foreman, and 23 percent by some "other" person. This other person may sometimes be a migrant worker; it is difficult to say how often, but we know that this situation does occur occasionally. (See Table 62.)

Table 63 shows how this work was spread out over the week. On Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday the work week peaked, with over 140 workers employed on each of these days. On Monday 122 had worked, and on Friday 128, so that there was some tapering off around the weekend. On Saturday 76 had worked, and on Sunday 41. The average number of hours a day the group had worked (if all workers are included) was 7.6 hours a day. But there is great variation. Around half of those working had worked nine or more hours every day but Saturday and Sunday, when 35 and 11 percent, respectively, had worked nine or more hours. A fair minority (from 2 to 21 percent each day) had worked 11 or more hours, and some of these had even worked 13. (See Table 64.)

The length of the work day varied according to the crop (Table 65). The longest work day was put in by the processing workers. Forty percent of those working on processing on any one day worked from 11 to 13 hours. An average of 61 percent worked 9 or more hours (Table 66). Processing workers tended also to work a somewhat longer work week than others, and this inflates the figure somewhat. Among those working on all other crops, an average of 42 percent worked nine or more hours. An average of fifty-two percent of vegetable workers worked nine or more hours (Table 67). Too few potato workers fell into the sample to permit any definite statement about hours of work. See Table 68 for the hours of those about whom we know.

For tree fruit other than apples, 44 percent worked nine or more hours; for apples, 26 percent worked nine or more hours (Tables 69 and 70). The

TABLE 61

NUMBER OF MIGRANTS WORKING DIFFERENT NUMBERS OF DAYS IN THE SURVEY WEEK

Number of Days Worked	Migrants	
	Frequency	Percent
Missing	3	3
7	27	15
6	38	22
5	29	17
4	41	23
3	13	7
2	9	5
1	9	5
0	6	3
Total	175	100

TABLE 62

WHO SUPERVISES THE MIGRANT ON HIS PRESENT JOB

Supervisor	Migrant Workers	
	Frequency	Percent
Missing	4	2
Farm owner	44	25
Crew chief	37	21
Farm manager, foreman	33	19
Other workers	1	1
No one	15	9
Other	41	23
Total	175	100

TABLE 63

NUMBER OF MIGRANTS WORKING ON EACH DAY
OF THE SURVEY WEEK

Day	Migrants	
	Frequency	Percent*
Monday	122	70
Tuesday	140	80
Wednesday	146	83
Thursday	144	82
Friday	128	73
Saturday	76	43
Sunday	41	23

*175 migrants = 100 percent

TABLE 64

NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED EACH DAY OF THE SURVEY WEEK
BY THOSE WORKING THAT DAY

Number of Hours	Migrants Classified by Hours Worked Each Day						
	Mon.	Tues.	Weds.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.	Sun.
1-4	14 (11)	15 (11)	3 (02)	6 (04)	19 (15)	7 (09)	6 (15)
5-7	20 (16)	29 (21)	24 (16)	19 (13)	26 (20)	24 (32)	13 (32)
8	28 (23)	29 (21)	34 (23)	47 (33)	26 (20)	18 (24)	17 (41)
9	17 (14)	21 (15)	31 (21)	25 (17)	20 (16)	4 (05)	3 (07)
10	26 (21)	25 (18)	32 (22)	29 (20)	21 (16)	7 (09)	1 (02)
11-13	17 (14)	21 (15)	22 (15)	18 (13)	16 (13)	16 (21)	1 (02)
Total working this day	122	140	146	144	128	76	41

Numbers in parentheses = percent.

TABLE 65

NUMBER OF HOURS PER DAY FOR ALL DAYS BY MAJOR CROP WORKED ON IN THE SURVEY WEEK

Number of Hours, All Days	Major Crop Worked on in Survey Week				
	Processing	Potatoes	Other Vegetables	Apples	Other Tree Fruit
1-4	5 (02)	11 (06)	13 (20)	15 (15)	25 (15)
5-7	13 (06)	38 (19)	16 (25)	22 (22)	60 (35)
8	69 (31)	45 (23)	17 (27)	17 (17)	42 (25)
9	4 (02)	40 (20)	8 (13)	38 (39)	18 (11)
10	43 (19)	61 (31)	6 (09)	3 (03)	17 (10)
11-13	89 (40)	2 (01)	4 (06)	3 (03)	9 (05)
Total man days worked	223	197	64	98	171

Numbers in parentheses = percent.

TABLE 66

NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED EACH DAY OF THE SURVEY WEEK
BY PROCESSING WORKERS

Number of Hours	Migrants Classified by Hours Worked Each Day							
	Mon.	Tues.	Weds.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.	Sun.	Total
1-4	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	5
	(03)	(06)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(03)	(05)	(02)
5-7	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	13
	(08)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(06)	(38)	(06)
8	8	10	9	10	11	10	11	69
	(22)	(29)	(28)	(31)	(34)	(28)	(52)	(31)
9	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	4
	(06)	(-)	(03)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(05)	(02)
10	9	6	7	8	6	7	0	43
	(25)	(18)	(22)	(25)	(19)	(19)	(-)	(19)
11-13	13	16	15	14	15	16	0	89
	(36)	(47)	(47)	(44)	(47)	(44)	(-)	(40)
Total working this day	36	34	32	32	32	36	21	223

Numbers in parentheses = percent.

TABLE 67

NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED EACH DAY OF THE SURVEY WEEK
BY MIGRANTS WORKING ON OTHER VEGETABLES

Number of Hours	Vegetable Workers Classified by Hours Worked Each Day							
	Mon.	Tues.	Weds.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.	Sun.	Total
1-4	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	11
	(07)	(06)	(03)	(03)	(06)	(03)	(06)	(06)
5-7	2	5	4	3	11	10	3	38
	(07)	(14)	(11)	(09)	(31)	(59)	(27)	(19)
8	9	6	7	14	6	3	0	45
	(33)	(17)	(19)	(41)	(17)	(18)	(-)	(23)
9	5	7	8	6	7	3	4	40
	(19)	(20)	(22)	(18)	(19)	(18)	(36)	(20)
10	9	14	17	10	10	0	1	61
	(33)	(40)	(46)	(29)	(28)	(-)	(09)	(31)
11-13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
	(-)	(03)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(09)	(01)
Total workers	27	35	37	34	36	17	11	197

Numbers in parentheses = percent.

TABLE 68

NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED EACH DAY OF THE SURVEY WEEK
BY MIGRANTS WORKING ON POTATOES

Number of Hours	Potato Workers Classified by Hours Worked Each Day							
	Mon.	Tues.	Weds.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.	Sun.	Total
1-4	2 (15)	0 (-)	0 (-)	2 (15)	8 (67)	1 (20)	0 (-)	13 (20)
5-7	3 (23)	3 (33)	4 (33)	1 (08)	1 (08)	4 (80)	0 (-)	16 (25)
8	3 (23)	4 (44)	4 (33)	5 (38)	1 (08)	0 (-)	0 (-)	17 (27)
9	2 (15)	1 (11)	2 (17)	2 (15)	1 (08)	0 (-)	0 (-)	8 (13)
10	1 (08)	1 (11)	1 (08)	2 (15)	1 (08)	0 (-)	0 (-)	6 (09)
11-13	2 (15)	0 (-)	1 (08)	1 (08)	0 (-)	0 (-)	0 (-)	4 (06)
Total workers	13	9	12	13	12	5	0	64

Numbers in parentheses = percent.

TABLE 69

NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED EACH DAY OF THE SURVEY WEEK
BY MIGRANTS WORKING ON OTHER TREE FRUIT

Number of Hours	Other Tree Fruit Workers Classified by Hours Worked Each Day							
	Mon.	Tues.	Weds.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.	Sun.	Total
1-4	3	6	0	1	3	1	1	15
	(27)	(25)	(-)	(05)	(17)	(33)	(100)	(15)
5-7	2	5	4	5	4	2	0	22
	(18)	(21)	(21)	(23)	(22)	(67)	(-)	(22)
8	2	3	4	5	3	0	0	17
	(18)	(12)	(21)	(23)	(17)	(-)	(-)	(17)
9	4	8	9	9	8	0	0	38
	(36)	(33)	(47)	(41)	(44)	(-)	(-)	(17)
10	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
	(-)	(04)	(05)	(04)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(03)
11-13	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
	(-)	(04)	(05)	(04)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(03)
Total workers	11	24	19	22	18	3	1	98

Numbers in parentheses = percent.

TABLE 70

NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED EACH DAY OF THE SURVEY WEEK
BY MIGRANTS WORKING ON APPLES

Number of Hours	Apple Workers Classified by Hours Worked Each Day							
	Mon.	Tues.	Weds.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.	Sun.	Total
1-4	6	5	2	2	5	3	2	25
	(22)	(17)	(05)	(06)	(22)	(30)	(29)	(15)
5-7	9	14	12	10	10	3	2	60
	(33)	(48)	(31)	(28)	(43)	(30)	(29)	(35)
8	5	5	9	12	5	4	2	42
	(19)	(17)	(23)	(33)	(22)	(60)	(29)	(25)
9	2	2	7	5	1	0	1	18
	(07)	(07)	(18)	(14)	(04)	(-)	(14)	(11)
10	4	2	5	5	1	0	0	17
	(15)	(07)	(13)	(14)	(04)	(-)	(-)	(10)
11-13	1	1	4	2	1	0	0	9
	(04)	(03)	(10)	(06)	(04)	(-)	(-)	(05)
Total workers	27	29	39	36	23	10	7	154

Numbers in parentheses = percent.

time that it is possible to work varies from job to job because of conditions of light (indoor work is not affected), weather, and the state of the crop. It also varies, one must suppose, with the difficulty of the task; surely going up and down ladders with 50 pound sacks of apples for long periods is an extremely fatiguing job, and also one affected by weather conditions. Even under such constraints, the work days are often long, but an average of 50 percent of apple pickers worked less than a full eight-hour day. Similarly the average number working less than an eight-hour day was also relatively large for those working on other tree fruit, 37 percent, and probably for similar reasons.

Reasons for not working on a given day differed according to the day of the week. Table 71 shows how many work days out of the total possible work days (multiplying the 175 workers by the number of days) were lost on the different days of the week and for what reasons. For example, on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday there were 525 possible work days (3 times 175). Eighty-eight of these days (or 17 percent of all the work days) were lost to work for a variety of reasons: 69 percent for work-related reasons (weather, crop not at peak, no work available, looking for work) and 10 percent because of bad health. Thus the migrants did not lose many work days for avoidable personal reasons. On Mondays and Fridays 26 percent of the possible work days were lost; 63 percent of them were lost for work-connected reasons, 6 percent because of illness, and 30 percent for a variety of other reasons. On Saturdays 53 percent of the possible work days were not spent working, about half (49%) for work-connected reasons and half (51%) for personal or other reasons. On Sunday 71 percent of the possible work days were not spent working, about one-third (32%) for work-connected reasons and two-thirds (68%) for personal or other reasons. The migrants thus tended to work a five- or six-day week; yet many worked on weekends, and of these some worked a 13-hour day (Table 72).

TABLE 71

REASONS WHY MIGRANTS ARE NOT WORKING ON GIVEN DAYS

Reason	Number of Days Off for Each Reason							
	Tuesday, Wednesday & Thursday		Monday & Friday		Saturday		Sunday	
	Freq.	%**	Freq.	%**	Freq.	%**	Freq.	%**
Bad weather	19	4	22	6	8	5	3	2
No work available	22	4	22	6	23	13	30	17
Crop not yet at peak	19	4	14	4	14	8	7	4
Looking for work	1	-*	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sick or injured	9	2	6	2	3	2	3	2
Family responsibilities	2	-*	1	-*	5	3	2	1
National or religious holiday	0	0	11	3	1	1	17	10
Took a day off	6	1	6	2	16	9	33	19
Other	10	2	10	3	22	13	30	17
Total days lost	88	17	92	26	92	53	125	71
Total no. work days possible	525	100	350	100	175	100	175	100

*Less than 1 percent.
**Percent represents proportion of total possible work days. Percents for specific categories each day might not add up to totals due to rounding.

TABLE 72

REASONS WHY MIGRANTS ARE NOT WORKING ON GIVEN DAYS

Reason	Number of Days Off for Each Reason							
	Tuesday, Wednesday & Thursday		Monday & Friday		Saturday		Sunday	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Work related	61	69	58	63	45	49	40	32
Personal	17	19	13	14	24	26	38	30
Other	10	11	10	11	22	24	30	24
National or religious holiday	0	0	11	12	1	1	17	14
Total days off	88	100	92	100	92	100	125	100

*Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

To summarize: much of the time that migrants have an opportunity to work they do so, and they often work long hours. They tend to take Sunday off (71% did) and a little over half took Saturday off.

Family Members in the Work Situation

Only a minority of migrant workers report another family member as working with them either in New York or elsewhere. Most often this family member is a spouse; 18 percent reported a spouse working with them in New York, and 12 percent outside of New York. But a few people reported children of varius ages or parents or grandparents working with them. Eight percent reported a brother or sister working with them in New York; 7 percent reported some other family member. (See Table 73.)

The sexes differed considerably as to whether the migrant's spouse was working with him or her: 44 percent of the women had a spouse working with them, but only 10 percent of the men. Twenty-three (or 56 percent) of the women did not have a spouse working with them, but 121 men (or 90 percent) did not have a spouse working with them. (See Table 74.)

Only 2 percent of the Puerto Ricans had a spouse with them, whereas 22 percent of the black migrants did. Half of the 12 Mexican-Americans were accompanied by a working spouse. (See Table 75.) There is some tendency for older migrants to be accompanied by a working spouse (Table 76). Only 11 percent of those traveling without a working spouse had working children with them, whereas 58 percent of those accompanied by a working spouse had a child with them. Only 2 percent of the males, but 17 percent of the women, reported having a working child with them.

To summarize: black migrants, Mexican-Americans, women, and older workers more often tended to have a working spouse with them. Those accompanied by a working spouse tended to have a working child along, women more

TABLE 73

NUMBER OF MIGRANTS REPORTING VARIOUS FAMILY MEMBERS WORKING WITH THEM IN AND OUT OF NEW YORK

Family Member	In New York State		Outside New York State		
	Frequency	Percent*	Frequency	Percent*	Missing
Spouse	31	18	21	12	(44)
Child less than 6 yrs. old	2	1	1	1	(47)
Child 6 to 15 years old	3	2	2	1	(47)
Child over 16 years old	6	3	4	2	(46)
Parents or grandparents	5	3	2	1	(47)
Brother and/or sister	14	8	-	-	
Other family member	12	7	6	3	(47)

*175 migrants = 100 percent

TABLE 74

NUMBER OF MIGRANTS BY SEX WHOSE SPOUSES ACCOMPANY THEM TO NEW YORK AND WORK WITH THEM

Response	Male		Female	
	No.	%	No.	%
No	121	90	23	56
Yes	13	10	18	44
Total	134	100	41	100

TABLE 75

NUMBER OF MIGRANTS, BY ETHNIC GROUP, WHOSE SPOUSES ACCOMPANY THEM TO N.Y. AND WORK WITH THEM

Have Spouse Working With Them	Black		Puerto Rican		Mex.-Amer.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.
No	77	78	54	98	6
Yes	22	22	1	2	6
Total	99	100	55	100	12

TABLE 76

NUMBER OF MIGRANTS BY AGE WHOSE SPOUSES ACCOMPANY THEM TO N.Y. AND WORK WITH THEM

Spouse Accompanying and Working With Them	Age Group									
	20 or under		21 to 30		31 to 40		41 to 51		Over 50	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No	33	97	51	80	31	89	20	74	9	60
Yes	1	3	13	20	4	11	7	26	6	40
Total	34	100	64	100	35	100	27	100	15	100

often than men. Black migrants, women, and older workers more often had family members with them.

Role of the Crew Leader

Sixty-three percent of the migrants reported that they had worked with a crew leader at some time in their lives. Forty-two percent reported that they had worked with one in the past year. Of the 74 persons who had worked with a crew leader in the last year, 58 percent had worked with one from 1 to 3 months, 25 percent from 3 to 6 months, and only 17 percent for a larger portion of the year.

Table 77 shows that the crew leader plays a role in a minority of the worker's work situations at present. Twenty-three percent had their job chosen by the crew leader, and in 21 percent of the cases he supervised their farm work.

In 18 percent of the cases, he had provided transportation to the present job; in 10 percent he had advanced travel money, and in 5 percent provided free transport. In 14 percent of the cases, the crew leader provided local transportation to the local job site and to the health clinic. For very small proportions of the migrants the crew leader loans money and provides other local transportation. Apparently the stereotype of the crew leader managing, advancing money for, and transporting the crew from job to job is no longer valid in the sample area. A considerable number of the migrants operate essentially independent of such leadership for the greater part of the time.

Adult Contact with Agencies and Programs

There are a variety of agencies--federal, state and private--that help migrant farmworkers in New York State. It would require a separate study to

TABLE 77

ROLE OF THE CREW LEADER IN MIGRANT'S PRESENT NEW YORK WORK SITUATION

Functions of Crew Leader	Migrants for Whom Crew Leader Provides Service	
	Number	Percent*
Decides which farm to work on	40	23
Supervises farm work	37	21
Traveled to present job with migrants or organized bus or truck	31	18
Advanced money for travel to N.Y.	7	4
Provided travel to N.Y. free	9	5
Loaned money to workers while they waited to begin work	9	5
Provides transportation from camp to field	25	14
Provides free transport to health clinic	25	14
to food shopping	16	9
to other shopping	14	8
Provides transport and charges for it:		
to health clinic	2	1
to food shopping	1	1
to other shopping	2	1
Migrants who worked with a crew leader this year**	74	42
Migrants who have ever worked with a crew leader**	110	63

*175 migrants = 100 percent.

**3 were crew leaders.

describe precisely which agencies give what kinds of help to what migrants or families in what areas. There is a complex web of services, and analyzing its possible redundancies or gaps in certain areas of service is not easy without considerable research.

Eight sources of supplemental income available to migrants, each with different eligibility requirements, were listed in the survey schedule. (In addition, there are two other agencies that give some income supplement on occasion in the form of food vouchers [see Table 78].) Table 79 lists these eight programs and shows the number of respondents who received aid from each program this year and at some time in the past. The most heavily used is the Food Stamp program. Only 11 percent of the migrants have received Food Stamps this year, but 50 percent have at some time in the past. As described in the section of the report on camp life, a substantial portion of the migrants (23 percent) eat in commissaries. If it were not for this fact, the proportion of migrants using Food Stamps might be greater.

The other source of supplemental funding used by migrants is Unemployment Insurance, which only four of the respondents reported receiving during the summer of the survey, although 27 percent of the sample had received it sometime in the past. Considering their long periods of unemployment, the proportion receiving this help does not seem high.

Nine percent had at some time had help from Home Relief and from Aid to Families of Dependent Children, but only 3 and 2 percent, respectively, during the survey year. From the rest of the programs providing additional income--Supplemental Income, Workers' Compensation, Veterans' Payments, and Welfare--not more than 5 percent of the migrants had ever received help (Table 79). Migrant farmworkers must surely be among the people for whom these programs are designed, since they usually have a considerable family burden to support on small incomes. Do the rules of eligibility for some reason exclude this group of people, or do they need much more help in

TABLE 78

ADULT PARTICIPATION IN AGENCY PROGRAMS

Program	Respondents Receiving Assistance					
	This summer			In the past		
	Number	Percent	No Answer	Number	Percent	No Answer
State Employment Service	6	3	1	16	9	8
Manpower, job/training placement, CETA	2	1	1	5	3	10
Vocational Rehabilitation	0	0	2	2	1	10
Adult Migrant Education	8	5	4	5	3	11
Legal Services	1	1	1	2	1	8
Program Funding (PFI)*	2	1	2	3	2	11
Community Action Affairs/ Neighborhood Service Centers*	2	1	1	3	2	9
Welfare**	7	4	3	9	5	9

Total number of respondents = 175.

*These agencies also supply supplemental income at times in the form of food vouchers.

**Supplies medical and dental care as well as income.

TABLE 79

RESPONDENTS' RECEIPT OF INCOME SUPPLEMENTS AND FINANCIAL AID

	Respondents Receiving Assistance					
	This summer			In the past		
Program	Number	Percent	No Answer*	Number	Percent	No Answer*
Food Stamps	20	11	2	87	50	2
Supplemental Income	7	4	1	8	5	9
Unemployment Insurance	4	2	1	47	27	4
Workers' Compensation	3	2	1	8	5	4
Home Relief	6	3	5	15	9	8
Aid to Families of Dependent Children	4	2	4	16	9	8
Veterans' Payments	4	2	1	6	3	7
Welfare**	7	4	3	9	5	9

Total number of respondents = 175.

*Or not applicable.

**Supplies medical and dental care as well as income.

finding out about their rights to aid? If the former is the case, an appraisal of the situation could lead to recommendations for a different kind of income assistance granted by a federal or state government agency designed especially to meet their situation.

Only small proportions of adults made use of any kind of health service other than health clinics (see Table 80). Unfortunately, our information on adult use of doctors and health clinics is poor because of some confusion in the form of the question. Seven percent said they had used a private dentist in the preceding year, and three percent a dental clinic. Again, there may be some underreporting of use of family planning, mental health services, and alcohol and drug abuse programs due to reasons of personal privacy. But if the comparison in use of other services holds for services other than dental, the migrants make much more use of health services for their children than for themselves.

There are at least seven agencies involved in giving a wide variety of other kinds of help to migrants, and probably more. At any rate, in this survey the migrants were asked about their contacts with seven: the New York State Employment Service, Program Funding (now Rural New York Farm Worker Opportunities, Inc.), CETA, Vocational Rehabilitation, Legal Services, Community Action Affairs/Neighborhood Service Centers, and Adult Migrant Education. Less than ten percent of the migrants admitted to having ever received aid from any of these agencies or programs. The largest proportion, 9 percent, had at some time received help from the New York State Employment Service, and 9 percent from CETA. The same two, along with Adult Migrant Education, had the highest proportions receiving aid in the past year, and these did not reach more than 9 percent. Every effort was made to ascertain the correct names of agencies or any other name by which they might be known to migrants. It is possible that there is some underreporting of agency contacts, because migrants might not know that an individual person who

helped them, whom they knew by name, represented a given agency. They also may have had some contact with agencies from whom they did not feel they had received "help", and it is possible that they do not recognize some of the less concrete or transient forms of assistance as "help." But all of these reasons still leave us with the fact that the names of these agencies are not well known in the migrant farmworker camps. There is at least a wide communication gap. If these agencies are to render help effectively, the migrants need to know who they are, what they do, and how to get in touch. More than this, it does appear in the last analysis that the agencies collectively are indeed reaching only a small proportion of the migrants; perhaps not as small as indicated in the survey, but not very large. Additional support indicating that these findings of low agency contact are substantially true comes from the evidence on child care, where we did find that a substantial majority had utilized some services, and even from the other adult services information, as 50 percent reported having received Food Stamps at some time. That is, it is not that migrants do not report knowledge and use of any program; a few they know of and use extensively.

Additional evidence of such a communication gap was given in the section that discussed the migrants' lack of knowledge of the Hot Line number and lack of access to the telephone. Solving this problem probably demands a great deal more coordination of efforts among agencies serving migrants.

Child Care

The migrant families reported a total of 412 children in all. However, that summer only 34 families had brought children to camp with them, so there were only 84 children in the camp, or about 20 percent of all of the families' children. Seventy-three of the children (87 percent of them) belonged to black migrant workers, two to Puerto Ricans, and eight (10 percent) to

Mexican-Americans; one child belonged to a member of another ethnic group (Table 81).

The children ranged in age from under one year to 20. The bulk of them, however, were young. Thirty-five percent were under 6 years old (pre-school children); 58 percent were under 11. If the children older than five are divided into school-age groupings, 35 children (42 percent) were aged 6 to 14, elementary and junior high age; 10 children (12 percent) were 15 to 17 years old, high school age; and 7 children (8 percent) were 18 or over. (See Table 82.)

A number of public and private agencies offer services for migrant children. These include day care for children of various ages, health and dental programs, lunch programs and school. Program participation by children takes a variety of forms. Only two families reported that their children neither ate lunch with the family nor participated in a day care, school, or lunch program (Table 83). Most children, then, are taken care of for lunch.

A substantial proportion participate in programs for child care. Sixty-one percent of the children were enrolled in some kind of program that takes care of them for a substantial portion of the day. Such programs include summer school, Day Care, and Headstart. Four children were getting supplementary tutoring in school, and five were participating in the outdoor education program, a program for school children conducted during the school day (Table 84).

Fifty-seven percent of the children had attended a health clinic at least once during the year, and 45 percent of the children had attended a dental clinic. Of those attending the health clinic 65 percent had been to a health clinic once, 32 percent twice. Seven percent of the day care mothers said they had received nutrition education from the Women's and Infant's Care program during the past year (see Table 85).

TABLE 80

ADULT RESPONDENTS' USE OF HEALTH PROGRAMS

	Used Program		Number Missing
	Number	Percent	
School doctor	4	2	4
Dental clinic	6	3	2
Private dentist	12	7	3
Family planning service in a clinic	3	2	0
Mental health service i.e. crisis intervention, suicide prevention	1	1	0
Alcohol abuse program	0	0	0
Drug abuse program	0	0	0

TABLE 81

CHILDREN IN THE CAMPS

Children with:	Number	Percent
Black workers	73	87
Puerto Rican workers	2	2
Mexican-American workers	8	10
Other workers	1	1
Total number of children in camp	84	100

Number of families with children in camp = 34.

TABLE 82

AGE OF MIGRANT CHILDREN
LIVING IN THE CAMPS

Years of Age	Number
0 or 1	7
2	9
3	4
4	5
5	4
6	3
7	4
8	4
9	6
10	3
11	5
12	3
13	6
14	1
15	3
16	4
17	3
18	1
19	4
20	2
No answer	3
TOTAL	84

Years	Number	Percent
0 to 5	29	35
6 to 14	35	42
15 to 17	10	12
18+	7	8
No answer	3	4
TOTAL	84	100*

*Percents do not add to 100 because of rounding.

TABLE 83

WHERE CHILDREN GET THEIR MEALS

	Number Responding	Percent
No children	147	84
Eat with parents	6	3
Day care/lunch program	20	11
Other	2	1
Total	175	100

TABLE 84

PARTICIPATION IN CHILD CARE PROGRAMS DURING SURVEY YEAR

	Number Attending	Percent*
Summer school	19	23
Day care	28	33
Headstart	2	2
Tutoring program	4	5
Outdoor Education	5	6
Summer Feeding	1	1
Women, Infants' and Children's Program	12	14
Dental clinic	38	45
Health clinic	48	57

*Total number of children in child care programs = 84. (Some children may participate in more than one program.)

When we look at the data on knowledge about programs and lifetime use of them, we get a similar picture. Forty-four percent of the families with children had had children in summer school at one time. Sixty-eight percent had had a child in Day Care and 32 percent in Headstart at some time. Seventy-three percent of the families had at some time taken a child to a health clinic and 56 percent to a dental clinic. Small proportions have used other programs: 20 percent Women's and Infant's care; 12 percent outdoor education; 9 percent summer feeding; and 6 percent the tutoring program. (See Table 86.)

Only small proportions of the families that had not at some time used the programs admitted to having ever heard of them, although those who had, professed to understand them. This could either indicate that most people who know about a program proceed to participate in it or that unless people take advantage of a program they forget that they ever heard about it. There is probably a good deal of selective inattention on the part of workers who do not think that they need or want a particular program when they do hear about it. But there also appears to be (as will be discussed later) a real communication gap between migrants and agencies for a variety of reasons. And there probably is a good deal of selective forgetting by those who have heard about a program and have understood it but have not used it. However, the fact remains that there are child care programs known and utilized by a great majority of families who are eligible, so communication is not by any means always lacking. There are some programs which migrant workers hear about, understand, and utilize to a great extent.

Migrant Views

Migrant views were solicited on a variety of topics, and these help to fill in our picture of migrant life and migrant needs. They were asked if

TABLE 85

NUMBER OF TIMES A CHILD HAS BEEN TO THE HEALTH CLINIC

	Number of Children	Percent
Once	24	65
Twice	12	32
Three times	1	3
Total number of children who have been to the health clinic during the year	37	100

TABLE 86

KNOWLEDGE OF AND PARTICIPATION IN CHILD CARE PROGRAM

	Families With Children					
	Heard of It		Know What It Is		Ever Used	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Summer School	19	11	16	47	15	44
Day Care	24	71	23	68	23	68
Headstart	15	4	13	38	11	32
Tutoring program	5	15	4	12	2	6
Outdoor Education	5	15	6	18	4	12
Summer Feeding	5	15	5	15	3	9
Women, Infants' and Children's Program	8	24	10	29	7	20
Dental clinic	22	65	19	56	19	56
Health clinic	27	79	24	71	25	73
Number of families with children in camp	34	100	34	100	34	100

they would stay in New York permanently if they could do so. Fifty-three percent said that they would definitely like to stay in New York; 3 percent more said maybe they would. They were also asked if they expected to return next year and the year after for migrant work. Forty-nine percent definitely expected to return the next year, and 42 percent said they might. Thirty-six percent said that they would definitely return the year after that, and 50 percent said maybe they would (see Table 87). This corresponds with the material in an earlier section on how long migrants have been coming to New York, in that while some have been coming for a very long time, many have been coming only a few years. Thus there is some stability but also a considerable amount of turnover; and as a result most of the group are fairly young and perhaps will eventually find other occupations.

The types of jobs for which migrants would like to train gives us additional information about what their aims in life seem to be and how agencies might better meet these goals. A total of 40 different jobs were named as jobs for which they would like to train. If we group these into rough categories, the category the largest number of migrants aspired to was skilled trades, with 39 percent; auto mechanic alone was mentioned by 28 persons. Other such jobs were carpenter, electrician, construction worker, bricklayer, plumber, welder, TV repairman, diesel mechanic, heavy equipment operator, and the like. Eleven percent aspired to various types of service jobs: chef, barber, social worker, nurse's aide, etc. Sixteen (9 percent) aspired to professional or semiprofessional jobs, 6 percent to office or clerical jobs, and smaller proportions to small business, transportation jobs, or getting more general education. One percent (2 people) were interested in agriculture, 3 percent said they would train for anything, and 11 percent said there was nothing for which they would like to train. Most of the workers had something in mind for which they would like to receive training,

and most of these jobs appeared to be realistic choices and to represent skills that would guarantee them steady employment. Also, many choices would provide a lot of independence and autonomy over the job. (See Table 88.)

What are their views of migrant farm work? Thirty-three percent of the workers said they did not dislike anything about farm work; 6 percent disliked everything. The majority named a specific dislike, and at least one person named each of 18 specific dislikes (see Table 89). The only ones named by more than one worker were: a specific farm job (10 percent); missing their family (7 percent); uncertainty of work (6 percent); low pay and hard work (5 percent each); outdoor work and poor housing (4 percent each); travel, long hours, and cold or rainy weather (3 percent each); and abuse (2 percent).

As for likes, some aspects of the job disliked by some were named as likes by others (see Table 90). Among these were travel (14 percent liked it), the pay (15 percent thought it was good), working outdoors (5 percent), weather (2 percent), and a specific farm job (6 percent). Seven percent liked being their own boss, 6 percent liked the freedom, 3 percent each liked the working conditions and meeting new people, 2 percent each liked the seasonal nature of the employment and New York State. Seventeen percent liked nothing, and 12 percent liked everything.

At the end of the interview migrants were asked what other needs they had that were not being met. A theme that has run through the evidence presented is that much of the time the migrant and his family are independent; they take care of their own problems and needs, they work hard, and they do not ask for help. This is borne out by the fact that 50 percent answered the question about needs other than money that were not being met by saying that they had no such needs. Six percent did not answer. The other 44 percent of the answers were scattered among a variety of responses

TABLE 87

DOES THE MIGRANT EXPECT TO RETURN TO NEW YORK?

	Migrants			
	Next Year		The Year After Next	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Missing	4	2	6	4
Yes	85	49	63	36
No	12	7	18	10
Maybe	74	42	88	50
TOTAL	175	100	175	100

TABLE 88

TYPES OF JOBS FOR WHICH MIGRANTS WOULD LIKE TRAINING

	Number	Percent
Skilled trades: auto mechanic, carpenter, electrician, construction, brick layer, plumber, technician, welder, TV repair, diesel mechanic, heavy equipment operator, machines	69	39
Professional or semiprofessional: airplane pilot, funeral director, social worker, doctor, teacher, engineer, interpreter	16	9
Service jobs: serving, barber, chauffeur, chef, hospital work, nurse's aid	20	11
Office and clerical: bookkeeper, cashier, offset press, secretary	10	6
Craftsmen, small business: dry cleaning, upholsterer	2	1
Transportation: truck driver, railroad work	8	5
Agriculture: farmer, fruit buyer	2	1
More general education	8	5
Anything	6	3
Other jobs: factory work, work with children, baseball player	7	4
Nothing	19	11
No answer	8	5
Total	175	100

TABLE 89

WHAT MIGRANT DISLIKES ABOUT MIGRANT FARM WORK

Dislikes	Number	Percent
Missing	8	5
Everything	11	6
Nothing	58	33
Travel	5	3
Outdoors	7	4
Cold or rainy weather	6	3
Specific farm job	18	10
Long hours	5	3
Low pay	8	5
Abuse	4	2
Uncertainty of work	10	6
Hard work	8	5
Fruits are bad	1	1
Working night shift	1	1
Working under contractor	1	1
Working by the hour	1	1
Gets too dirty	1	1
Picking fruit	1	1
Poor housing	7	4
Being stranded	1	1
Missing family	13	7
Total	175	100

TABLE 90

WHAT MIGRANT WORKERS LIKE ABOUT MIGRANT FARM WORK

Likes	Number	Percent
Missing	4	3
Nothing	29	17
Everything	21	12
Travel	25	14
Money	27	15
Own boss	12	7
Freedom	10	6
Working outdoors	9	5
Specific farm job	11	6
Working conditions	5	3
Easy work	1	1
Seasonal	3	2
Weather	3	2
Unemployment	1	1
Piece work	1	1
Agricultural work	1	1
Meeting new people	6	3
Liked experience	2	1
State of New York	3	2
When it's time to go home	1	1
Total	175	100

that are grouped into categories in Table 91. Fourteen percent named money, even though they were asked what needs other than money they had, apparently feeling that money would really solve whatever these were. Eight percent named house-related needs, 4 percent named work-connected problems (working conditions, a job, retirement), 4 percent mentioned transport-related needs, 2 percent each medical or emergency help and education, 1 percent basic necessities (food, clothing) or more information. Three percent mentioned other things (basketball, visitors, etc.).

The migrants were then asked if they had any other comments they would like to make. Seventy-five percent (or 131) had no other comments. Those who had comments ranged over a wide variety of things, sometimes including things named in the likes and dislikes. The few topics that were mentioned more than once were: not enough money (7 persons), "too many things to mention" (4 persons), better living conditions (3 persons), enjoyment of the interview, and satisfaction with the job (2 persons each).

The picture that emerges from these responses supports the rest of the findings. The migrants are a hard-working, independent group that mainly look to solve their own problems. About half would like to remain here, and about half expect to return at least one more year. They do have dislikes connected with their work; they also have likes. Most would like to train for skilled jobs that are realistic aspirations in terms of their education. Such jobs would provide them a better and steadier income but would still leave a good deal of independence, autonomy, and freedom on the job.

Conclusions

The authors arrived at a number of conclusions based on the results of the study. Others who read this bulletin may arrive at different conclusions of their own, but the following are offered for discussion.

TABLE 91

WHAT OTHER NEEDS MIGRANT HAS THAT NEED TO BE MET

Type of Need	Number	Percent
Missing	11	6
None	88	50
Work-connected	7	4
Transportation	7	4
Education	7	4
Housing-related	14	8
Medical, emergency help	3	2
Basic necessities (food, clothing)	2	1
More general information	8	5
Money	24	14
Other	4	2
Total	175	100

What does all of this mean for agencies and people trying to help migrants?

1. Different ethnic groups tend to work on different crops, spend different portions of the year working in New York, and have different family situations. The Puerto Ricans tend to have larger families, but the black migrant workers more often bring spouses and children to New York State. Most of the families interviewed in which the children and the wife had come to New York State were black.

2. Virtually all of the migrants have a permanent address at which they spend the greater part of the year. Only a few work at other farm jobs between New York and their home state. Black migrants from the southern states work on other seasonal farm jobs in the south, and a minority work also at nonfarm jobs. The Puerto Ricans seldom work at farm jobs outside of New York, and only in a minority of cases work at nonfarm jobs.

3. Income information, while deficient, indicates that the migrants operate close to or below the official poverty level, especially in the case of the Puerto Ricans. Large families tend to be relatively worse off. Yet they do not seem to receive much financial aid from federal, state or local sources, with the exception of food stamps. Do they not know how to apply, or do eligibility rules unfairly exclude them from aid they should be receiving?

4. Migrants work long hours while in New York and apparently avail themselves of most of the work opportunities possible. Other than parts of Saturday and Sunday, they tend to work when work is available. They usually arrive in New York a few days before work begins and leave immediately after finishing. Therefore, considering the fatiguing nature of the work, not much time or energy is left for participation except in work. Any help to this group needs to be carefully designed for immediate practical help of

direct relevance to workers' major needs and administered with a minimum of effort or inconvenience on the part of the migrant worker. There is little time or energy for luxury programs or energy-consuming participation.

5. Thought needs to be given to the problem of agency communication with the migrant workers. Thirty-eight percent lacked access to a telephone, and only small proportions knew of or used programs of help available to them. Those working for migrants need to coordinate efforts designed to reach them. Some new scheme needs to be devised. One approach that comes to mind is some kind of interagency effort to coordinate information about services, under which each camp would have a main contact person who would visit the camp often, take responsibility for getting to know the migrants, ascertain their problems, and put them in touch with the proper agency. Such a person could look at the problems of a family as a whole and would help reduce the remoteness and impersonality of agency contact. Thirty-eight percent of the migrants have no easy way of getting in touch with an agency even if they knew which one to call and how to call.

Over and above such an effort directed at more effective utilization of services that exist, there is need for a broad assessment of agency programs as they relate to migrants--the pattern of services, the array of services, what kinds of help should be offered and are offered, what kinds migrants really cannot make much use of or are tangential to their needs. It is not suggested that some redundancy of effort is not a useful thing. Some programs and workers will appeal to one migrant and not to another. Some can work with farmers more effectively; some might be needed to express farmworkers' viewpoints. But a great deal more cooperation would still leave plenty of room for the individual agency initiative that is a good tradition in this country.

6. In the immediate work situation there are problems that might be addressed. One of these might be standardization of units in terms of which job rates are announced so that workers could compare their earnings in one situation with another and understand better exactly what these earnings are. Another suggestion arises from the fact that most farmers intend to keep on using migrants, and many migrants intend to keep coming to New York. Under such circumstances, perhaps some tax incentives might be devised for farmers to make improvements in the migrant housing. Such improvements would benefit both the farmer and the worker.

7. The role of the crew leader appears to have changed radically from the early days, at least in the study area, and is much reduced due to legislation enacted recently. Migrants tend to operate much more independently now, take care of more of their own needs, and have more direct relations with the farmers.

8. In view of the fact that most migrants spend a good portion of their year at a permanent home base and that a large portion of these homes are located in a small number of states, good opportunities exist for joint program planning for migrant programs with these other states.

9. Child care programs are heavily used. While a minority of the children of the migrant families actually come with them to New York, those that do derive much benefit from the various child care and health programs. Most migrant children in the study area are black.

10. The low income of the migrants is understandable in terms of the large parts of the year when they are unemployed, their comparatively low educational levels, the low-paid jobs available to them, and their abnormal expenditures connected with travel and relocating their households at least twice a year. Most migrants would like educational opportunities to train for skilled trades, and the jobs they aspire to should be possible for

people at their educational level. It is not easy to see how to provide such opportunity, but the opinions of these migrants may provide some indication as to where resettled migrants would like to go in the job world. As for improving the situation of the migrant, perhaps a more comprehensive look is needed at ways to provide income and job assistance adapted to the needs and situation of this group so as to improve their quality of life and provide a stable work force for agriculture.